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# Economy & Jobs Adv

## 1NC FL – Econ Advantage

#### 1. No Solvency - deep structural problems preclude solvency for the Mexican economy – trade and investment alone aren’t able to solve

Gonzalez 2013   
Aleyda González – Op-ed “The unjustified optimism over Mexico's economy” Entre Noticias Site is run by multi-awarded Mexican journalist Rubén Luengas website (www.rubenluengas.com), about News / Public Affairs from California, México and the World. 3/12/13 http://rubenluengas.com/index.php/english-posts/item/97-the-unjustified-optimism-over-mexicos-economy

Apart from the assumed agreement of political consensus, nothing has really changed in Mexico to ensure that today’s economy has the conditions for it to become a global power. Esquivel scrutinizes a series of elements that only lead to believe that Mexico’s economy is no different than what it was years ago. In fact he asserts that “a Mexican worker makes less today per hour of work than he did 30 years ago.” On a 12-year comparison against similar income level countries, Esquivel proves that Mexico’s GDP has remained the second lowest in Latin America for the past five years, only above Haiti. The GDP per equivalent adult in 2012 was exactly at the same point it was in 1978 ($14,000). Poverty levels have not changed significantly in the past decade, ranging from 53.1 percent (of the total population) in 1992 to 51.3 in 2010. As Esquivel points out, a change in perception may help attract new investments, but the reality is Mexico faces a deep structural problem that is not being addressed by the current political agreements. Therefore, “excessive optimism on the future evolution of the Mexican economy is clearly unjustified. Most likely, we can expect to continue in a mediocre path in both, the short and the medium terms"

#### 2. Turn - trade with Mexico hurts US jobs – on balance, job gains from exports are outweighed by lost manufacturing jobs

Scott 11  
Robert E. Scott, Director of Trade and Manufacturing Policy Research at the Economic Policy Institute, “Heading South: U.S.-Mexico trade and job displacement after NAFTA, “ May 3, 2011, <http://www.epi.org/publication/heading_south_u-s-mexico_trade_and_job_displacement_after_nafta1/>

The United States had a small $1.6 billion trade surplus with Mexico in 1993, the year before NAFTA took effect. By 1997, the United States had developed a $16.6 billion trade deficit with Mexico, which increased to $97.2 billion in ¶ 2010, as shown in Table 1. Between 1997 and 2010, the U.S. trade deficit with Mexico increased $6.2 billion per year, ¶ or 14.6% per year. ¶ This paper estimates the impact of that change in trade on employment by calculating the labor content of changes ¶ in the trade balance—the difference between exports and imports. For example, each $1 billion in U.S. auto parts ¶ exported to Mexico supports U.S. jobs, but each $1 billion in autos and trucks imported from Mexico displaces the ¶ workers who would have been making them in the United States. On balance, the net employment effect of trade flows ¶ is determined by changes in the trade balance. Growing trade deficits usually result in job displacement.

The employment impacts of trade deficits are assessed using an input-output model that estimates the direct and ¶ indirect labor requirements of producing output in a given domestic industry. The model includes 202 U.S. industries, ¶ 84 of which are in the manufacturing sector.9¶ The model estimates the amount of labor (number of jobs) required to ¶ produce a given volume of exports and the labor displaced when a given volume of imports is substituted for domestic ¶ output. The net of these two numbers is the estimated number of jobs displaced by changes in the trade balance, holding ¶ all else equal.

U.S. exports to Mexico in 2010 supported 791,900 jobs, but U.S. imports displaced production that would have ¶ supported 1,474,800 jobs, as shown in the bottom half of Table 1. Therefore, the $97.2 billion U.S. trade deficit with ¶ Mexico in 2010 displaced 682,900 jobs.10 Since the United States had a small trade surplus in 1993 (not shown), all of ¶ those jobs were displaced between 1993 and 2010.11 On average, 40,200 jobs have been lost or displaced per year since ¶ NAFTA took effect.12

U.S. jobs displaced by the trade deficit with Mexico are a net drain on employment in trade-related industries, ¶ especially those in the manufacturing sector. Even if increased demand in other sectors absorbs all the workers displaced ¶ by trade (an unlikely event), job quality is likely to suffer, as many non-trade-related industries, such as retail and home ¶ health care, pay lower wages and have less comprehensive benefits than trade-related industries.

#### 3. No Solvency - there’s no room for major growth in exports to Mexico – they’re already maxed out and competition from Europe and China

Piccone 2012   
Ted Piccone, senior fellow and deputy director for foreign policy at the Brookings Institution “What Would a Romney Victory Mean for Trade With the Region?”

By Roger Noriega, Ted Piccone, Andrés Rozental, Stephen Johnson, Michael Allion

October 25, 2012 Inter-American Dialogue's Latin America Advisor. http://www.thedialogue.org/page.cfm?pageID=32&pubID=3117

A: Ted Piccone, senior fellow and deputy director for foreign policy at the Brookings Institution: "Mitt Romney's claim that Latin America is 'a huge opportunity' for the United States in terms of trade and investment sounds good but is exaggerated. In general, the 32 countries of the hemisphere are growing at an above average rate, due largely to Asia's growing demand for its natural resources. The United States generally has fared well in trade and investment terms, with exports doubling since 2000 under a web of free-trade agreements promoted by both parties. Getting Congress to approve trade pacts with Colombia and Panama in 2011 was a major breakthrough. But it's hard to imagine that Latin America will suddenly become the engine for U.S. exports. We already export more to the region than to Europe; and twice as much to Mexico as to China. On the downside, our share of the region's market has declined significantly in the last decade, with China and Europe stepping in with cheap goods and favorable terms. So while both candidates, not surprisingly, call for expanded trade with the region, neither has a clear diplomatic or political roadmap for achieving it. Ever since Brazil torpedoed Bill Clinton's vision of a Free Trade Area of the Americas, the United States has pursued a series of smaller agreements that, while helpful, leave wide swaths of the region's growing markets (mainly Brazil) up for grabs. So the trade agenda with Latin America, because it plays to both candidates' arguments about reviving the economy, does at least get a nod. Otherwise, except for the obligatory teeth-baring toward Hugo Chávez and the Castro brothers, the region is simply ignored. That's because the big issues on the agenda between the United States and the region-drugs, guns and crime; migration; and Cuba-all touch on hotwired domestic political issues that leave little room for winning votes."

#### 4. Turn – Maquiladoras:

#### A. Expanded border crossings cause Maquiladora revival

Paley 2013   
Dawn Paley is a journalist from Vancouver, BC (Coast Salish territories). She’s written for magazines and newspapers including the The Guardian, Vancouver Sun, The Globe and Mail, BC Business Magazine, and The Nation. In 2010, Dawn completed her Masters in Journalism at the University of British Columbia. “A Rough Guide to Obama’s Mexico Visit” Americas Program of the Center for International Policy 5/2/13 <http://www.cipamericas.org/archives/9449?utm_source=feedly>

There’s a demand from the corporate sector to build new border crossings and expand existing ones between Mexico and the US. “Financially, investment in border crossings and infrastructure has not matched the exponential increase in trade crossing the border each year,” reads a December memo from the Council on Foreign Relations. This border infrastructure is necessary for the maquila (assembly) industry in Mexico to expand, and the US requires Mexico’s cooperation on these crossings, the construction of which amount to huge subsidies for the US and other corporations with operations along the US/Mexico border.

#### B. Maquiladoras hurt the Mexican economy – cause wage stagnation and concentration of wealth

Diederich 2012  
Phillippe Diederich is a freelance writer, photographer & educator. His work has appeared in the NYT, Time magazine, US News, and he has won numerous awards for his photography & writing. Born in the Dominican Republic & raised in Mexico City and Miami. “Do not be fooled by the ‘Maquiladora Economy’” July 17, 2012 http://www.voxxi.com/do-not-be-fooled-by-maquiladora-economy/#ixzz2UeLxV0Wh

Maquiladora is a Mexican word. It’s the nickname that was given to the manufacturing plants along the US-Mexico border, which sprouted up after the Brasero program ended in the sixties and the Mexican government began the Border Industrialization Program. It comes from the word, maquila, the quota millers charged for milling other people’s grain. Today, there are thousands of maquiladoras in just about every country in Latin America and Asia.¶ Countries with favorable conditions for maquiladoras must have all of the above: high poverty, high national debt, corrupt governments (dictatorships friendly to the U.S are a favorite) weak union organizations and financial incentives so foreign businesses can import their raw materials and export their finished product without having to pay fees to the host country. Maquiladoras, or assembly plants must be within a duty-free zone, and items must be tax and tariff free.¶ Yep, if your country’s got that, you can bet your sweet pesos the maquilas will come knocking, if they’re not already there. But if wages rise, unions organize, or the government changes its tax-free policy for maquilas, watch out! You could lose your maquilas to a more convenient country, one that is poorer and has even worse wages than yours.¶ That’s exactly what happened in Guatemala when workers got fed up with a Korean manufacturing plant. The Koreans shut down operations there, and are moving their maquiladora to Haiti where poorer more desperate people are willing to put up with their miserable wages and working conditions. And guess what, in this particular case the land is a gift courtesy of the willing Haitian government. The new port and buildings for the new manufacturing giant comes courtesy of the U.S. government. Which really means you, the tax payer. The poor people of the world thank you.¶ The problem with maquiladoras is that they create stagnant economies. Workers who assemble items for export cannot improve their lot because wage increases and upward mobility are virtually non-existent. In the world of maquilas, it’s as if the Soviets had won the cold war, only it’s capitalist corporations that are the culprits of such Dickensian misery.¶ But there’s an even greater problem with ‘Maquiladora Economics.’ Maquilas only benefit the corporations the their rich stockholders. The poor who manage to find work at a maquila are only taking one step out of one type of poverty and into another. It is an inert economy for those who work there. And all this is done so that we in the U.S.A. can satisfy our hunger for cheap name-brand shoes, multiple TVs in a single house, and fourteen-dollar shorts from Old Navy and Walmart, or even 300-dollar tennis shoes at Sacks.¶ Meanwhile, the workers at the Maquila cannot afford to go to the GAP in Mexico City and buy a t-shirt. But as these conditions and methods of manufacturing go full speed ahead, it’s also the U.S. middle class that is being crushed. The fact is the U.S. middle class cannot afford goods manufactured within our own economy. And the gap is getting wider.

## Ext. to Frontline Arguments

### Ext. 1NC #1: Economy – Alt causes – Mexican Economy

#### **Multiple alternative causes – faulty credit, informality, elite control, ineffective education, vulnerability to shocks**

Hanson 2012  
Gordon H. Hanson Professor Hanson holds the Pacific Economic Cooperation Chair in International Economic Relations at UC San Diego, research associate at the National Bureau of Economic Research Ph.D., Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1992 (economics) “Understanding Mexico's Economic Underperformance” Regional Migration Study Group August 2012 http://www.migrationpolicy.org/pubs/rmsg-mexicounderperformance.pdf

Any discussion of growth and development in Mexico ends up resembling a Diego Rivera mural, overstuffed with historical characters that collide in repeated and unexpected ways. In effect, Mexico’s underperformance is overdetermined. The faulty provision of credit, persistence of informality, control of key input markets by elites, continued ineffectiveness of public education, and vulnerability to adverse external shocks each may have a role in explaining Mexico’s development trajectory over the past three decades. Still, the relative importance of these factors for the country’s growth record is unknown. The breadth and depth of reform in Mexico is astounding, yet the country does not have much to show for it. To improve its economic position, Mexico must decide how best to confront its disappointing growth record. Items worth placing on the country’s policy agenda include: • improving protections for creditors by giving creditors more scope to seize assets of borrowers in the event of default; • eliminating artificial incentives for workers to enter the informal sector by eliminating the implicit subsidization of workers in the informal sector by workers in the formal sector through Mexico’s dual system of social protection; • raising the incentive of youth to continue education, expanding opportunities for vocational and technical education, promoting continuing education among working adults, and encouraging collaboration with the country’s private sector in assessing and investing in the country’s human capital; • implementing anti-monopoly provisions in Mexican law to make telecommunications more competitive; • and reforming the energy sector to reduce electricity prices. Each of these items has been mentioned by other observers as deserving attention by the Mexican government, but none is easy to accomplish. Improving protections for creditors may be unpopular politically, as it would benefit a financial sector that is today primarily foreign owned. Eliminating subsidies for informal workers would require significant changes in Mexico’s health care system (e.g., providing universal coverage) and payroll tax structure. Any changes to the education system would require standing up to Mexico’s politically powerful teachers unions and to university students who tend to be vociferous opponents of reform to higher education. Previous governments have been unsuccessful in regulating Telmex, although the integration of cable, Internet, and mobile services is allowing new actors to emerge and may give the government greater bargaining power. Reforming the energy sector would likely require changes to Mexico’s constitution.

#### **The problems in the Mexican economy are too widespread and deep for the plan to solve.**

Aguila et al. 2010   
Emma Aguila Director, Center for Latin American Social Policy; Economist; Professor, Pardee RAND Graduate School Santa Monica Office Education Ph.D. in economics, University College London; M.Sc. in economics, University College London; B.A. in economics, Instituto Tecnológico Autónomo de México (ITAM) “United States and Mexico : ties that bind, issues that divide” RAND Corporation INVESTMENT IN PEOPLE AND IDEAS

The second part of this monograph describes Mexico’s economic and social climate, two of the most important catalysts of Mexican immigration to the United States. Although relatively stable (before the current economic downturn, whose effects remain to be seen), Mexico’s economic and social situation is in need of vast reform in many areas. Our examination of the factors yielding an increase in migration and the current state of the Mexican economy suggest that poverty in Mexico is still very widespread and that, while economic inequality has not grown since 1996, neither has it been reduced. Despite the intended benefits for Mexico with the establishment of NAFTA, which created the world’s largest free-trade area and several economic reforms of the 1990s, Mexico’s economic competition with other countries still remains relatively weak. The country lags behind most other developing countries in terms of competitiveness rankings; the World Bank and the World Economic Forum place Mexico in 44th and 52nd place respectively, competing with China, India, and Chile for foreign investment. Although President Calderón has passed legislation to reform the country’s weak judicial system and improve a generally excessive bureaucracy, these factors are generally thought to feed an underdeveloped competition culture. It has been estimated that regulatory burden alone costs Mexico at least 15 percent of its GDP. Fiscal policy in Mexico faces enormous challenges as well. Comparison with other OECD countries indicates that Mexico has one of the lowest tax-to-GDP ratios. Moreover, the government remains dependent on the revenue of PEMEX, Mexico’s state-owned oil monopoly. As much as 45 percent of federal government revenue stems from oil taxes, and, while Mexico is currently the sixth-largest oil producer in the world, production at the primary oil fields is projected to decline rapidly in the next decade. PEMEX has just begun to invest in the kind of R&D needed to compete in the global market, but many still believe that the failing oil reserves will further harm Mexico’s fiscal well-being. Finally, there is increasing evidence of widespread tax eva sion by Mexico’s large informal sector of workers, which is estimated to account for 20 percent of the profits generated in the country.

### Ext. 1NC #2: Hurts US Jobs

#### Accelerating US-Mexico trade empirically causes American job losses, not gains.

Strachan 2011   
Maxwell Strachan Business Editor, The Huffington Post “U.S. Economy Lost Nearly 700,000 Jobs Because Of NAFTA, EPI Says” http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2011/05/12/nafta-job-loss-trade-deficit-epi\_n\_859983.html

The historic agreement, signed just three years after the collapse of the Soviet Union, tore down trade barriers between the U.S., Canada and Mexico, making trade and investment easier for businesses without allowing for the cross-border movement of labor. Despite the agreement being considered a boon for Mexico, the country's economy grew only 1.6 percent per capita on average between 1992 and 2007, The New York Times reported in 2009. The EPI's calculation of 682,900 jobs lost to NAFTA takes into account jobs created as a result, too. Last year, for example, U.S. exports to Mexico supported 791,900 jobs. It's just that those jobs created pale in comparison to the 1.47 million U.S. jobs that would be necessary without the imports resulting from NAFTA, the report found.

#### Cross-border trade causes job losses across the US – particularly in manufacturing.

Strachan 2011   
Maxwell Strachan Business Editor, The Huffington Post “U.S. Economy Lost Nearly 700,000 Jobs Because Of NAFTA, EPI Says” http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2011/05/12/nafta-job-loss-trade-deficit-epi\_n\_859983.html

Perhaps the most drastic switch post-NAFTA has been in the two country's trade deficit. In 1993, before the signing of NAFTA, the U.S. held a $1.6 billion trade surplus over their neighbor to the south, which supported 29,400 jobs. By 1997, the tides had turned, and Mexico laid claim to a much larger surplus of $16.6 billion. As of 2010, it's not even close. Mexico's trade surplus now hovers around $97.2 billion. Jobs continue to be lost to NAFTA today. In the years 2007-2010, the U.S. economy has lost 116,400 as a result of the trade deficit created by NAFTA. And last year, the growth of Mexican auto exports to the United States alone created more Mexican jobs -- 30,400 -- than the entire U.S. auto industry. It's the U.S. manufacturing sector that has suffered most mightily from NAFTA, alone accounting for 60.8 percent -- 415,000 total -- of the jobs lost to the agreement. Specifically, those making computer of electronic parts have accounted for 22 percent of all job losses, and motor vehicle and parts workers accounted for 15 percent of job losses. Job losses haven't been limited to certain geographic regions, either, as all fifty states have lost jobs as a result. And while the states with the largest total number of job losses, California and Texas, do hug the southern border, it's actually manufacturing-heavy states to the north, such as Michigan, Indiana and Kentucky, that have lost the largest share of jobs to Mexico.

#### Trade with Mexico is devastating to domestic job growth. The historical data of NAFTA proves this – more than a million jobs have been lost since the treaty’s implementation.

Public Citizen 2011   
Public Citizen is a nonprofit organization that does not participate in partisan political activities or endorse any candidates for elected office Public Citizen serves as the people’s voice in the nation’s capital. Since our founding in 1971, we have delved into an array of areas, but our work on each issue shares an overarching goal: To ensure that all citizens are represented in the halls of power. NAFTA’s Broken Promises 1994-2013: Outcomes of the North American Free Trade Agreement <http://www.citizen.org/documents/NAFTAs-Broken-Promises-2011.pdf>

13 Services and manufacturing export growth slows under NAFTA. A key claim of supporters of NAFTA-style trade pacts is that they create jobs by promoting faster U.S. export growth. By contrast, growth of U.S. exports to countries that are not Free Trade Agreement (FTA) partners has exceeded U.S. export growth to countries that are FTA partners by 38 percent over the last decade.14 Manufacturing and services exports in particular grew slower after NAFTA took effect. Since NAFTA’s enactment, U.S. manufacturing exports to Canada and Mexico have grown at less than half the rate seen in the years before NAFTA.15 Even growth in services exports, which were supposed to do especially well under the trade pact given a presumed U.S. comparative advantage in services, dropped precipitously after NAFTA’s implementation. During NAFTA’s first decade, the average growth rate in U.S. services exports fell by 58 percent compared to the decade before NAFTA, and has remained well below the preNAFTA rate through the present. 16 One million American jobs lost to NAFTA. The Economic Policy Institute estimates that the rising trade deficit with Mexico and Canada since NAFTA went into effect eliminated about one million net jobs in the United States by 2004.17 EPI further calculates that the ballooning trade deficit with Mexico alone destroyed about seven hundred thousand net U.S. jobs between NAFTA’s implementation and 2010.18 Moreover, official government data reveals that nearly five million U.S. manufacturing jobs have been lost overall since NAFTA took effect. 19 Obviously, not all of these lost U.S. manufacturing jobs – one out of every four of our manufacturing jobs – is due to NAFTA. The United States entered the World Trade Organization (WTO) in 1995, China joined WTO in 2000 and the U.S. trade deficit with China soared thereafter. However, at the same time, given the methodology employed, it is also likely that the EPI estimates do not capture the full U.S. job loss associated with NAFTA. Service sector jobs have also been negatively impacted by NAFTA, as closed factories no longer demand services. EPI estimates that one third of the jobs lost due to the rising trade deficit under NAFTA were in non-manufacturing sectors of the economy.

### Ext. 1NC #3: Cross Border Trade Not Key to US

#### **The value of trade between the US and Mexico is small, the aff’s stats are inflated, maquiladora border transactions are not vital to the economy.**

Baker 2013   
George Baker is Managing Principal of Baker & Associates, Energy Consultants (BAEC), founded in 1990 and now based in Houston. He is publisher of Mexico Energy Intelligence® (MEI) Letter to the Editor, NYT 2/14/13 http://www.energia.com/letter-to-the-editor-nyt-thomas-friedmanhow-mexico-got-back-in-the-game/

The “game” to which Mr. Friedman refers is statistical legerdemain. This is a game that Mexico plays adroitly, especially since 1991 when the government added “border transactions,” which referred to maquiladora assembly operations, to the national accounts. The move was to inflate Mexico’s status as a trading partner with the U.S. in order to promote NAFTA. Take out intra-firm transactions in which Chrysler-Mexico sells to Chrysler-China, and daily trade will shrink to the value of commerce in oil and food products, services (including oilfield services), plus the remnants of a tourism industry battered by violence. Meanwhile, Carlos Slim skims off the top of the Mexican economy monopolistic rent whose value has been estimated by Mexican economists at 3 percent of Mexico’s GDP. As for the “massive cheap natural gas finds,” the reference is to the 400+ TCF of shale gas, which will doubtless still be there a generation from now, as Pemex has no plans to develop shale fields. The new government, meanwhile, is almost certain to limit its reforms to making Pemex more efficient by any means except that of market competition. Celebrations about Mexico’s advances in its economy and governance are premature.

### Ext. 1NC #4: Uniqueness – Maquiladoras Down Now

#### Maquiladoras are decreasing in the status quo

Beck 2013

Dr. Allan Beck, Doctor of Management, University of Phoenix Prof. School of Business Strayer University, “Mexico Needs to Proactively Educate Maquiladora Workers” Research in Applied Economics ISSN 1948-5433 2013, Vol. 5, No. 1

Many maquiladora jobs have disappeared since 2000, and it may be time to work toward developing a new strategy, as the low-cost and low-wage model is not always competitive when compared with other producing areas of the world. The highest concentration of lost jobs in maquiladoras was from 2000 to 2003, and there has been slow growth since, but manufacturing jobs are still at a lower level than the peak. A large segment of the population continues to suffer as a result of the negative growth in manufacturing (Mendoza, 2010). Infrastructure deficiencies like a poor educational system, and other factors like globalization and financial downturns have left the traditional low-cost maquiladora model outdated and uncompetitive (Hadjimarcou, Brouthers, McNicol & Michie, 2013).

Mexico needs to establish a long-term strategy that will allow it to compete for high technology work because Mexico will need to lower costs by automating and performing tasks considered high-tech and advanced compared to the original maquiladora model. An increased effort on the part of the Mexican government to create policies that will enhance competitiveness and innovation in manufacturing (Carrillo, 2009). Mexico will need to emphasize and prioritize public education and find a way to provide additional university-level education to workers that only possess a high school education. Many Mexican workers only have the compulsory 9th grade education when entering the workforce and the only enhancement comes in the form of company sponsored training. The training is specific to a particular job or function and not in the realm of what education can produce.

### Ext. 1NC#4: Impact – Kills Mexican Middle Class

#### **Kills Mexican middle class – hurts Mexican AND US economies**

Johnson 2012   
Tim Johnson, McClatchy Newspapers “Mexico's 'maquiladora' labor system keeps workers in poverty” 6/27/2012 http://www.mcclatchydc.com/2012/06/17/152220/mexicos-maquiladora-labor-system.html#storylink=cpy

Whether Mexico can progress in the decades ahead by leaving Perez and many of the 7 million or so other industrial and assembly workers like him behind is a crucial issue. Cheap labor keeps goods inexpensive in U.S. markets, but it also hinders the growth of a consuming class in Mexico.¶ “If these folks had money, they’d be buying things we make as well as stuff made in Mexico,” said Davis, the United Steelworkers representative.¶ “When you have a decent middle-class tax base, you can afford better services,” said Pete DeMay, a Mexico organizer for the United Auto Workers. “That’s not the case near a lot of these plants.”¶ The desperation of workers is apparent. Many of those who can’t find weekend jobs peddle trinkets from their homes or turn to more radical measures, such as crossing the Rio Grande to sell their blood plasma in Del Rio for $25 to $35 per visit.¶ “I donated for about two years. But then my heart rate started going up,” said Rogelio Villarreal, a 35-year-old who was sitting in a car outside the one-story offices of Talecris Plasma Resources in Del Rio.

## Extensions/Additional Answers

### A2 Manufacturing – Not key to US Economy

#### Manufacturing not key to the economy – robotics and automation mean that increases in manufacturing are no longer linked to jobs

Florida 2013   
Richard Florida is Co-Founder and Editor at Large at The Atlantic Cities. He's also a Senior Editor at The Atlantic, Director of the Martin Prosperity Institute at the University of Toronto's Rotman School of Management, and Global Research Professor at New York University. Sorry Mr. President, Manufacturing Will Not Save Us RICHARD FLORIDA FEB 13, 2013 <http://www.theatlanticcities.com/jobs-and-economy/2013/02/sorry-mr-president-manufacturing-will-not-save-us/4656/>

1. Manufacturing does not generate a lot of jobs: American manufacturing is making a comeback, but is remains an anemic job creator. Manufacturing output is projected to grow from $4.4 trillion in 2010 to a projected $5.7 trillion by 2020, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics. But this increased manufacturing output — which stems from improvements in technology, greater use of robots and automation, and improved production organization — will not necessarily translate into a whole lot more jobs. In fact, the BLS projects the U.S. will lose another 73,100 manufacturing jobs by 2020, as manufacturing falls to just seven percent of total employment.

#### Even if manufacturing jobs grow, they aren’t good jobs anymore – they don’t pay more than service jobs and they’re more vulnerable to natural business cycles

Florida 2013   
Richard Florida is Co-Founder and Editor at Large at The Atlantic Cities. He's also a Senior Editor at The Atlantic, Director of the Martin Prosperity Institute at the University of Toronto's Rotman School of Management, and Global Research Professor at New York University. Sorry Mr. President, Manufacturing Will Not Save Us RICHARD FLORIDA FEB 13, 2013 <http://www.theatlanticcities.com/jobs-and-economy/2013/02/sorry-mr-president-manufacturing-will-not-save-us/4656/>

2. Not all manufacturing jobs are good jobs: Americans often think of manufacturing jobs as good, family-supporting union jobs, but unfortunately that's not actually the case. Production workers across the United States average just $34,220 per year according to the BLS, less than half that of knowledge, professional and creative workers ($70,890) and not that much more than what low skill service workers in fields like food preparation, clerical work and retail sales ($30,597) take home. Pay varies considerably across different types of manufacturing jobs. As I noted here last March:¶ The 66,530 tool and die makers or the 36,200 aircraft assemblers have great jobs earning - $48,710 and $45,230, respectively. But the nearly 150,000 sewing machine operators average just $22,630 a year, or $10.88 per hour.¶ While we like to think manufacturing jobs are secure, they are actually among the most vulnerable to the ups and downs of the business cycle. As I noted on Cities this past October, the unemployment rate for workers in blue-collar jobs increased to 14.6 percent during the economic crisis, more than three times the rate of 4.1 percent for knowledge, professional, and creative workers, and considerably higher than the 9.3 percent rate for workers in low-skill service jobs which we typically think of as more vulnerable.

#### Can’t compare new manufacturing jobs to existing ones – new jobs start at significantly lower wages

Florida 2013   
Richard Florida is Co-Founder and Editor at Large at The Atlantic Cities. He's also a Senior Editor at The Atlantic, Director of the Martin Prosperity Institute at the University of Toronto's Rotman School of Management, and Global Research Professor at New York University. Sorry Mr. President, Manufacturing Will Not Save Us RICHARD FLORIDA FEB 13, 2013 <http://www.theatlanticcities.com/jobs-and-economy/2013/02/sorry-mr-president-manufacturing-will-not-save-us/4656/>

Also, many manufacturing jobs that are being brought back onshore offer substantially lower wages then existing manufacturing jobs. "U.S. manufacturing wages have come under further pressure as large established companies like General Electric, Ford and others have instituted two-tier pay practices," I wrote on Cities last year based on a report by the New York Times, which found new hires making just $12 to $19 per hour compared to $21 to $32 per hour for established employees.

### A2 Economy – Plan no Solve

#### Cross-border trade is bad for the Mexican economy because it destroys industrial diversification, keeps wages low and hollows out the middle class.

Diederich 2013  
Phillippe Diederich is a freelance writer, photographer & educator. His work has appeared in the NYT, Time magazine, US News, and he has won numerous awards for his photography & writing. Born in the Dominican Republic & raised in Mexico City and Miami. “Is Mexico’s economic boom trickling down to all Mexicans?” 3/25/13 <http://www.voxxi.com/mexico-economic-boom-all-mexicans/>

Mexico’s economic boom not felt by all Recently, Thomas Friedman of the New York Times focused one of his editorials on the economy in Monterrey. He glossed over the facts and told us Mexico will be the dominant economic power of the 21st century, and quotes the Financial Times as saying Mexico has signed more free trade agreements than China or Brazil. The problem is that NAFTA, or the North American Free Trade Agreement, (and probably all free trade agreements) has hurt more than helped the average Mexican. These agreements are a treasure for multinational corporations who reap enormous profits. And while they do create low paying jobs, they also destroy small business, the backbone and muscle of the economy that directly affects the average Mexican . Manufacturing jobs create a new poor class in Mexico - Manufacturing along the border in what are nicknamed maquiladoras , was supposed to be the saving grace of Mexico in the 1980′s but none of it trickled down or even sideways for most Mexicans except for the few who secured jobs in these manufacturing plants. But decades later, many of these manufacturing workers remain in the same place, with the same or similar jobs and with little possibility of change. Never mind that wages in these factories have not kept up with inflation. What manufacturing does is it turn places into mini-boom towns with people flocking to those areas searching for jobs that are already taken. While a class of workers moves up just slightly, another poor class is created, as it happened in towns like Juarez and Nuevo Laredo back in the 80′s and 90′s. And yet in Toluca and Puebla, where automobile and automobile parts manufacturing has been on the rise since the 1990′s, the changes have been more positive. The automobile industry offers some possibility of upward mobility because of the more complex nature of building a car compared to say, clothing or electronic manufacturing.As the Mexican government moves to take advantage of the good economic times, it is imperative that it diversify and honestly spread the wealth among the people of the country, (not ignoring poor southern states like Guerrero, Oaxaca and Chiapas). Tourism and manufacturing have always been a boon for the economy of the country, but it is through industrial diversity and infrastructure that the government can help bring jobs and growth to the far corners of the country so all Mexicans can participate and enjoy the rewards of a strong economy.

#### Increased trade with the US does not help Mexico because it only benefits multinational corporations. This disadvantages small and medium businesses which locks in structural economic failures.

Johnson 2012   
Tim Johnson | McClatchy Newspapers “As China’s wages climb, Mexico stands to win new manufacturing business” 9/10/2012

<http://www.mcclatchydc.com/2012/09/10/167930/as-chinas-wages-climb-mexico-stands.html#storylink=cpy>

Yet to be seen, though, is whether Mexico can follow China’s path and leverage its low-wage status into sustainable fast growth. To do so, it needs policies to foster small and medium businesses and move them into higher-end production, and to draw workers into the formal economy and push them up the economic ladder. Some analysts have doubts. “I would be quite cautious about talking of any Mexican euphoria over the return of these industries,” said Enrique Dussel Peters, coordinator of the China-Mexico Study Center at the National Autonomous University of Mexico. Unlike in China, where the Communist Party identifies “pillar industries” and orders banks to shovel loans their way, Dussel Peters said, Mexicans who are eager to start or grow businesses even in strategic sectors can’t get cash easily. “Smaller businesses in Mexico don’t have access to financing, and those that have it get it at a very high cost,” Dussel Peters said. Even with the North American Free Trade Agreement, the sweeping 1994 accord that ties Canada, the United States and Mexico together in the world’s biggest trade bloc, Mexico suffers from an “enclave economy,” of which the vast gated industrial parks along the U.S.-Mexico border are the most visible sign. Goods are assembled there for export, but rarely from parts manufactured in Mexico. That means the country’s economy doesn’t benefit as deeply as it might from its low-wage status. “It doesn’t make sense for Mexico in the long run to just sort of give up the production capacity by fiat to foreign suppliers,” said Frank Lange, the vice president of global development at Menlo Worldwide Logistics, a San Mateo, Calif., company that helps clients tighten controls of supply chains. That, however, is an issue for Mexican politicians and businesses debating how best to develop their country’s economy. For multinational companies that are looking to keep a lid on costs, it’s of little concern.

### Poverty

#### Growth in cross-border manufacturing can’t solve the problems in the Mexican economy – it only perpetuates poverty.

Diederich 2013  
Phillippe Diederich is a freelance writer, photographer & educator. His work has appeared in the NYT, Time magazine, US News, and he has won numerous awards for his photography & writing. Born in the Dominican Republic & raised in Mexico City and Miami. “Is Mexico’s economic boom trickling down to all Mexicans?” 3/25/13 <http://www.voxxi.com/mexico-economic-boom-all-mexicans/>

By all accounts the Mexican economy is booming. Earlier this month Time Magazine said Mexico’s “GDP expanded almost 4 percent in 2011 and 2012. Investment is booming and the middle class is enlarging.” And now with President Enrique Pena Nieto working to break down some old barriers like overhauling public education and privatizing the government run oil giant Pemex , Mexicans are bracing for what might come next. And foreign corporations are salivating, ready to pounce as Mexico becomes the new China. All of this despite dire poverty, the disenfranchisement of the rural poor, and continued drug related crime that leaves at least a thousand dead per month. Corruption and impunity continue to plague the country. Is any of this economic good news trickling down to all Mexicans, including the urban poor in metropolitan areas like Mexico City, Monterrey and Guadalajara, and the millions of peasants who live in rural areas? Mexico has had economic booms before: In the 50′s and in the 70′s when oil reigned supreme. But little of the rewards reaped by the few ever trickled down to the poor. Booms, in fact, have hurt the poor in the long run because of the economic crashes that inevitably follow these economic booms. When austerity measures and cutbacks in social programs are implemented to deal with difficult times, it is the poor who suffer the most. There is no doubt that steady growth is a good thing for Mexico, but unfortunately, much of the focus of the economic boom is based on manufacturing. While Mexico’s largest exports are beer, flat screen televisions, and cars, there is little room for advancement for the average worker in these industries.

### Not key to Global Economy

#### Mexico is not a global economic force – without addressing inequality and poverty trade can’t

Villagran 2013   
Lauren Villagran, Correspondent / April 24, 2013 “Is Mexico's economy more a fiesta or a siesta?” Christian Science Monitor http://www.csmonitor.com/World/Americas/2013/0424/Is-Mexico-s-economy-more-a-fiesta-or-a-siesta

There are two sides to the coin when comes to Mexico's future as a global economic force. The new government inherited an economy rebounding from the impact of the economic crisis, but how the administration approaches deep-rooted challenges like poverty and inequality will determine whether the current optimism gains momentum or peters out. Mexico’s potential remains enigmatic. There is no doubting the country’s macroeconomic successes, economists say. A stable currency over nearly 20 years, steady (if sometimes slow) economic growth; and fiscal discipline have combined to keep Mexico sailing in smooth waters. Mexico has signed a dozen trade pacts, which have opened it to the world. That’s the bird’s eye view. But zoom in and Mexico’s troubles come into focus. Despite a more open economy and a growing middle class, nearly half the population remains poor, living on as little as $80 per month or less. The widely industrialized north and central regions contrast with the poverty entrenched across much of the south. Nationwide, between 50 and 62 percent of workers toil in the informal economy, according to the World Bank – an uncharted area in which workers frequently don’t pay taxes and lack the safety nets of health insurance or employment contracts.

### A2 Econ – Mexico Key/Growth

#### Optimism about the Mexican economy is hype – structural problems preclude significant growth

Barba 2013   
“Mexico - Aztec Tiger On The Rise?” Alisa Barba Senior Editor Fronteras Desk, an award-winning journalist, producer, writer and editor with 25 years experience in both network and public broadcasting Monday, March 18, 2013 <http://www.fronterasdesk.org/news/2013/mar/18/mexico-aztec-tiger-rise/>

Many journalists and commentators have gotten on that compelling bandwagon: from The New York Times’ Thomas Friedman who recently claimed, “In India, people ask you about China, and, in China, people ask you about India: Which country will become the more dominant economic power in the 21st century? I now have the answer: Mexico." To Chris Anderson, former editor of Wired magazine and current CEO of 3D Robotics, singing the praises of manufacturing across the border in Tijuana in an op-ed titled, “The Tijuana Connection: A Template for Growth.” “The sense of possibility I felt when I first crossed from Hong Kong to Shenzhen in 1997 is what I now feel when I cross from San Diego to Tijuana. The trade routes of the 21st century don’t have to follow Marco Polo from West to East. Indeed, in the new manufacturing landscape, the routes don’t have to take you far at all.” Even the Washington Post has joined the chorus , saying the emerging Mexican middle class lives in a land where, “NAFTA dreams come true.” Wow. It’s a great story. The Mexican economy is booming, relatively speaking, with a growth rate exceeding 4 percent per year. As wages rise in China, “near-sourcing” becomes more attractive than “out-sourcing” and Mexico looks like a very compelling trade partner. A growing Mexican economy and middle-class could also help resolve another vexing problem — illegal immigration. Create jobs south of the Rio Grande, and the economic magnet in the U.S. loses power. But for anyone with experience in Mexico, it sounds too good to be true. And so there are also arguments penned in major newspapers and journals in the U.S. trying to put a damper on what seems naïve enthusiasm about Mexico’s imminent rise. The Miami Herald reports , for instance, on the fact that few people in Mexico seem to share Thomas Friedman’s optimism about their own country. A contributor to TIME magazine is skeptical as well, citing historical examples of how the “Mexican Miracles” has been over-hyped and wrong in the past.

#### Projections of explosive Mexican growth are wrong and empirically disproved – multiple structural factors preclude

Padgett 2013 Tim Padgett Time bureau chief for Miami & Latin America, reporting on the hemisphere from Tallahassee to Tierra del Fuego. He has chronicled Mexico’s democratization and drug war as well as the rise of Latin leaders like Lula and Hugo Chavez. “Mexico’s New Boom: Why the World Should Tone Down the Hype” March 08 Time Magazine <http://world.time.com/2013/03/08/mexicos-new-boom-why-the-world-should-tone-down-the-hype/#ixzz2UotXpNrg>

So as someone who has covered the country for almost 25 years, I tend to be wary when I see the blood-soaked headlines yielding all of a sudden to rose-colored banners hailing Mexico as “the Aztec Tiger” or “the New China.” Or when eminent columnists like the New York Times‘ Thomas Friedman rather hastily assert that Mexico will become a “more dominant economic power in the 21st century” than China. To his credit, Friedman points out that “crime syndicates, government corruption and weak rule of law hobble the nation.” But I worry about the emergence of an overweening boosterism that forgets what happened two decades ago—when belief in another Mexican miracle helped lead to one of the worst financial disasters in the country’s history.¶ This latest episode of It’s Always Sunny in Mexico evokes a familiar pattern. Because Mexico is attached to our southern border, it’s the only Latin American country that Washington and Wall Street feel they actually have to engage. Even so, they engage it grudgingly, and they get irritated when the media focus on its dysfunction—as was the case in the 1980s, Mexico’s Lost Decade of epic debt crisis. After Harvard-educated President Carlos Salinas de Gortari took office in 1988 and called for capitalist reforms that included a North American Free Trade Agreement, or NAFTA, word came down to us Mexico-based journalists from U.S. officials and business executives: All is transformed south of the border. Get with the program.¶ Salinas and his Armani-clad technocrats sold that bogus Mexican Miracle of overnight development remarkably well. So effectively, in fact, that few in the U.S. took notice when Mexico’s Potemkin façade, cracked by an indigenous uprising and a spate of political assassinations, started collapsing in 1994, culminating in a calamitous peso crash that required a $50 billion U.S. bailout. So forgive some of us if, almost 20 years later, we’re a bit reluctant to declare another fast-track Mexican Miracle and set aside our concerns about Mexico’s lingering dysfunction. Not just the mafia bloodletting, but the nagging failure to modernize a corrupt and incompetent judicial system. Not just the social inequality, which is still too vast, but the shameless business monopolies that exacerbate it by choking off competition and inflating prices.

### AT: Econ Decline => War

#### Diversionary theory is wrong – there’s no empirical evidence and the theory is based on faulty assumptions

Foster and Keller 10  
(2010, Dennis, PhD in political science, Assistant Professor, Virginia Military Institute, and Jonathan, PhD in political science, Assistant Professor of Political Science, James Madison University, “Rallies and the “First Image” Leadership Psychology, Scapegoating Proclivity, and the Diversionary Use of Force,” Conflict Management and Peace Science 2010 27: 417, sage)

Despite its compelling logic, general empirical confirmation of the diversionary hypothesis remains elusive (Levy, 1989). Of the many efforts exploring this lack of support, perhaps the most significant are those which contest the assumption that armed diversion “works”. The mere employment of the strategy is fraught with considerable risks and is morally quite objectionable. Moreover, while the use of force sometimes prompts astounding gains in approval, numerous studies conclude that rallies are normally quite short-lived and are generated with little or no consistency (e.g. Lian and Oneal, 1993; Oneal and Bryan, 1995). Indeed, research by Colaresi (2007) contends that domestic audiences are likely to abstain from rallying if they suspect leaders’ decisions to be spurred by base political concerns rather than the defense of the national interest. In all, if these arguments are correct, one may conclude (as do Meernik and Waterman, 1996) that the ambivalence of diversionary findings is not simply a matter of insufficient analytical frameworks or intervening caveats; it is instead attributable to the weakness of the core theory, and the validity of the entire diversionary research paradigm is open to question.

# Relations Adv

## 1NC FL – Relations Advantage

#### 1. No Impact – the US-Mexico partnership is too big to fail – areas of cooperation will always overwhelm differences

Rozental 2013   
Andrés Rozental, former deputy foreign minister of Mexico, works primarily on global governance issues, U.S.-Mexico relations and international migration. He served for many years in Mexico’s diplomatic corps. February 1, 2013 “Have Prospects for U.S.-Mexican Relations Improved?” Brookings Institute http://www.brookings.edu/research/opinions/2013/02/01-us-mexico-rozental

The Mexico-U.S. relationship won't substantially change; there are too many ongoing issues to expect any major shift in what has become a very close and cooperative bilateral partnership in economic, security and social aspects. There will be a change of emphasis from the Mexican side as far as the security relationship goes, with Peña Nieto's declared intention to focus much more on the economy and public safety. He has already moved away from the constant statements made by his predecessor extolling the number of criminals apprehended and 'successes' in the fight against organized crime. The change of message comes as a relief to many Mexicans tired of hearing about violence and crime on a daily basis.

#### 2. No Solvency: improving cross-border trade isn’t sufficient – problems related to the drug trade will undermine cooperation

Walser 2013   
Ray Walser, Senior Policy Analyst specializing in Latin America at The Heritage Foundation “Obama in Mexico: Change the Reality, Not the Conversation” 5/1/13 <http://blog.heritage.org/2013/05/01/obama-in-mexico-change-the-reality-not-the-conversation/>

Of course there is much value in an opportunities-oriented approach to U.S.–Mexico relations. The two countries have unique ties based on patterns of trade, investment, integrated manufacturing, and the movement of peoples. Both nations should continue to deepen this relationship by focusing on everything from trade, global competitiveness, and modernizing and securing our shared 2,000-mile border in ways that advance economic freedom and improve educational quality and energy development.

Yet addressing hard, seemingly intractable issues related to the illicit traffic in drugs, people, guns, and money moving with relative ease across the U.S.–Mexico border remains a major challenge for both leaders.

The Obama Administration has done little to reduce drug demand in the U.S. Consumption of marijuana is on the rise among teens. There is legal confusion in Washington following passage of legalization measures in Colorado and Washington. Resource reductions for drug interdiction and treatment are built into the fiscal crisis. Prior objectives for drug prevention and treatment established by the Obama Administration have not been met, according to the Government Accountability Office. Meanwhile, cash and guns flow south largely unchecked into Mexico.

Cooperation with Mexico may be scaled back or waning as U.S. officials are excluded from intelligence fusion centers the U.S. helped to set up. A new emphasis on citizen security may take the law enforcement heat of trafficking kingpins, who will likely attempt to move drugs across Mexico with less violence and greater efficiency as Mexican law enforcement focuses on the most violent criminal elements.

#### 3. No Impact – the risk of state collapse is low – the Mexican economy is well managed, the democratic system functions well, and no counter-state alternatives exist

Valdez 2009  
Diana Washington Valdez Experts say government stable despite mounting border violence / El Paso Times 2/9/2009 http://www.elpasotimes.com/news/ci\_11606866

Before Hayden's recent retirement from the CIA, he said Mexico could rank alongside Iran as a security challenge for President Barack Obama, maybe even a greater problem than Iraq, while the Joint Forces Command's "JOE 2008" said Mexico and Pakistan's governments were in danger of collapse.

Professor Josiah Heyman, a Mexico expert at the University of Texas at El Paso, said it's unlikely Mexico's governability has reached such a crisis stage.

"Part of the alarm was sparked by the fact the drug violence is taking place right next door to our border, in Juárez," Heyman said. "There are things in Mexico that are very negative, but others that are very positive, too. For example, it is managing its economy very well, it has stabilized the price of oil, and it's a real functioning democracy.

"But, it has not spread the wealth, and many decades have passed while the purchasing power of the Mexican people has fallen below what it was in 1982."

Heyman said a counter or alternative state must exist before a current state can collapse. While certain factors can lead to a government's collapse, Mexico still lacks a strong counter-state to fulfill all the conditions for a political meltdown.

## Ext. to Frontline Arguments

### Ext. 1NC #1: Relations are Resilient

#### Relations collapse is impossible – Mexico and the US are too interdependent, they have no choice but to get along

Hakim 2013  
Peter Hakim is president emeritus and senior fellow of the Inter-American Dialogue, a Washington-based policy organization tank on Western Hemisphere affairs. “Which Mexico for Obama?” 5/1/13 http://blogs.reuters.com/great-debate/2013/05/01/which-mexico-for-obama/

Crime and violence are likely to remain unrelenting challenges for Peña Nieto. They could even take central stage again. In fact, public security may not improve anytime soon — despite the new government’s multiple initiatives.¶ Peña Nieto’s predecessor, Felipe Calderón, learned how arduous a task it is to reform Mexico’s police and its justice system, and restore public confidence in them. Now, Peña Nieto is making clear his deep dissatisfaction with — and his intention to overhaul — Calderón U.S.-supported approach to security and drug issues. The expected changes will almost surely irritate many in Washington and may even become a new source of friction in the bilateral relationship.¶ But neither the United States nor Mexico is perfect. The two nations cannot look at each other only as sources of opportunity and gain; cooperation is needed to address risks and problems. Neither country has much of an option, however, because their economies and populations are so deeply integrated. There is no turning the clock back.¶ Mexico and the United State have to solve their problems together and find ways to generate and exploit new opportunities jointly. If they can do it, the payoff will be enormous.

#### US-Mexico relations are much more than trade and investment – these social connections ensure that economic ties will continue regardless of the plan.

Hakim & Litan 2002  
 Peter Hakim is president emeritus and senior fellow of the Inter-American Dialogue, a Washington-based policy organization tank on Western Hemisphere affairs. “; Robert E. Litan Senior Fellow in Economic Studies at the Brookings Institution. J.D. Yale, M. Phil. and Ph.D. in Economics Yale. Dr. Litan has served in several capacities in the federal government: As Associate Director of the Office of Management and Budget, Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Antitrust Division, Department of Justice; and Staff Economist, Council of Economic Advisers. Future of North American Integration. “Introduction” Brookings Institution Press, 2002. p 20.

Economic integration among the three countries already goes considerably beyond trade and investment. Mexicans continue to migrate in large numbers to the United States, principally in search of jobs and higher wages. Upwards of 21 million persons of Mexican origin now reside in the United States. Approximately 9 million of these were born in Mexico. They contribute in countless ways to the U.S. economy and society. Mexicans and Mexican Americans now send some $8 billion annually back to their communities. Although the numbers are still modest, a growing number of Mexicans are also finding their way to Canada. And tourism is expanding in all three countries, or at least it was before the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks on the United States. The three countries are tied together in many noneconomic ways as well. Mexicans are changing language pat- terns, social norms, and culture throughout the United States. As Mexican migrants become residents and citizens, they are increasingly influencing local and national politics. The voting strength and preferences of Mexican Americans are shaping U.S. policy toward Mexico. At the same time, U.S. cultural phenomena are increasingly pervasive in both Mexico and Canada— through films, TV, music, tourists, and student and professional exchanges. Nongovernmental organizations of many types function easily across the borders of all three countries. The Future of North American Integration Unless the three governments decide to halt further integration, recent trends strongly suggest that the societies and economies of the United States, Canada, and Mexico are likely to draw closer together. In particular, cross-border trade, investment, and migration should all continue to increase.

### Ext. 1NC #2: Alternate causalities – US-Mexico relations

#### **The plan can’t solve US-Mexico relations, American drug war hypocrisy is poisonous and overwhelms economic ties.**

Walser 2013   
Ray Walser, a veteran Foreign Service officer, is a Senior Policy Analyst specializing in Latin America at The Heritage Foundation May 2, 2013 “President Obama, the Drug War, and Mexico: Failure Is an Option” http://blog.heritage.org/2013/05/02/president-obama-the-drug-war-and-mexico-failure-is-an-option/

In the past six years, more than 60,000 Mexicans have died violently in crime and drug-related deaths. In the U.S., there is a wider spectrum of issues related to the harm done by drug usage. They range from state-side violence among traffickers, gangbangers, and dealers to drug-influenced auto fatalities and increasing abuse of prescription drugs. Mortality statistics indicate that drug-related deaths now exceed auto fatalities in the U.S. Prescription drug abuse reportedly claims a life every 19 minutes in the U.S. and has reached epidemic proportions. The White House still retains the power to set the national agenda and frame the political conversation at home and abroad. In his last conversation relating to drug issues in December 2012, President Obama, when asked about the passage of marijuana legalization laws in Colorado and the state of Washington, responded that the federal government had “bigger fish to fry.” These state laws run contrary to federal law and U.S. treaty obligations. Then-president Felipe Calderon of Mexico angrily fired back, questioning U.S. “moral authority.” When interviewed by the American Quarterly about his Mexican trip, the President answered no questions about drug trafficking. In Mexico this week, Obama will talk trade, immigration reform, education, and dance diplomatically around the drug issue. Fresh friction has emerged between the U.S. and Mexico over rules for counter-drug intelligence collection and sharing. Mexico’s current president, Enrique Peña Nieto appears to be concentrating on more centralized control over drug collection and operations on Mexican territory. Concerned about citizen security, Peña Nieto hopes to reduce the harm done to ordinary Mexicans as drugs flow across his nation’s territory to U.S. consumers. At the back of his mind also is a recognition that he is dealing with the same Administration that launched Operation Fast and Furious, which let guns walk across the border, and that argues marijuana legalization in Colorado and Washington is no big deal.

#### Drug violence overshadows strong US-Mexico economic ties.

Roseman 2012   
Ethan Roseman, Research Associate at the Council on Hemispheric Affairs “Enhanced Reciprocity for the U.S.-Mexico Relationship?”

December 17, 2012 http://www.coha.org/enhanced-reciprocity-for-the-u-s-mexico-relationship/

Although the current trade relationship between the United States and Mexico is unparalleled, the drug-induced side south of the border always seems to overshadow such a rapport. Since 2006, Mexico has experienced upwards of 60,000 deaths, including at least 3,000 police officers and soldiers who confiscated over 114 tons of cocaine, 11,000 tons of marijuana, 75 tons of methamphetamines and close to 100,000 large and small-scale firearms. Given the structured control of 90 percent of the cocaine that enters the United States and an estimated annual income of 18 to 39 billion USD, it is the Mexican drug cartels that truly govern these political units and furthermore, utilize extortion, corruption and extreme violence in order to bring about current hostile stereotypes that the rest of the world associates with Mexico.[3]

### Ext. 1NC #3: No State Collapse

#### No risk of government collapse or spillover

Valdez 2009  
Diana Washington Valdez Experts say government stable despite mounting border violence / El Paso Times 2/9/2009 http://www.elpasotimes.com/news/ci\_11606866

Karen Hooper, Latin American analyst for STRATFOR, a global intelligence service in Austin, said unless Mexico experiences a catastrophic event, such as the assassination of the president or a destabilizing terrorist attack, "it is unlikely for the government to collapse or for the U.S. military to play an active role in Mexico beyond one of cooperation, such as through the Merida Initiative."

"Yes, the violence has increased, but so far, it's been mostly cartel-on-cartel violence. The cartels have no interest in doing something that could lead to a U.S. military (response). If everything stays the same, the most that can happen is for the status quo to remain."

# Border Security Adv.

## 1NC FL – Border Security Advantage

#### 1. No Impact - the border is already secure - drug seizures are up and illegal immigration is down

New York Times 2013   
Damien Cave for the New York Times 3/3/13 “Long Border, Endless Struggle” http://www.nytimes.com/2013/03/03/world/americas/border-security-hard-to-achieve-and-harder-to-measure.html?pagewanted=all&\_r=0

Some Republicans argue that the southern border remains dangerously porous and inadequately defended by the federal government. Obama administration officials, insisting there is no reason for delaying plans to move millions of people toward citizenship, counter that the border is already safer and more secure than ever. They say record increases in drug seizures, staffing and technology have greatly suppressed illegal traffic, driving down border apprehensions to around 365,000 in 2012, a decline of 78 percent since 2000.¶ Indeed, by every indicator, illegal migration into the United States has fallen tremendously — in part because of stricter immigration enforcement — and has held steady at lower levels for several years.

#### 2. No Internal Link - Terrorists and Mexican Drug cartels are like oil and water – they won’t mix – it’s against both of their interests.

Cárdenas 2013

Ana Lucía Dávila Cárdenas Asesora de la Dirección General en Fundación Ethos, Assistant to the Director at the Ethos Foundation ITESM Campus Monterrey Bachelor of Arts (B.A.) in International Relations, International Relations and Affairs, Policy Intern - Hispanic Leadership Network American Action Network, Analyst assistant at the Permanent Mission of Mexico to the U.N. 3rd Commission: Human Rights “Why Al Qaeda is not likely to act Hispanic.” 4/26/13 http://policyinterns.com/2013/04/26/why-al-qaeda-is-not-likely-to-act-hispanic/

And Gohmert is not the first to have this idea. Janet Napolitano has openly wondered what would happen if terrorists and drug cartels joined forces. Unfortunately for Gohmert – and luckily for Napolitano- these asseverations are not only false, but also unlikely to happen. It is important to understand that a terrorist organization is a completely different institution from a drug cartel. Their bases, ideologies, philosophies, goals, and activities set them apart and make them like oil and water: unlikely to combine. Al Qaeda is a radical fundamentalist organization based in a specific ideology and philosophy that derives from the sixth pillar of Islam: Jihad. The “struggle” represented in the Quran as Jihad implies a personal effort against “evil” to pursue the values of the religion. As the fundamentalist organization it is, Al Qaeda intends to promote and impose the Sharia (moral code and religious law of Islam) and pursues a political end through religious means. On the other hand, the drug cartels represent a complex form of organized crime with no ideology or philosophy behind it and one only goal: the sustainability and success of their business. Al Qaeda has, at its core, a doctrine that provides logic and a complex rationale to every action of the organization to transform the pillars and goals of Islam into a way of life. Al Qaeda, like many other fundamentalist organizations, recruits followers of the same doctrine in order to assure the purity and authenticity of its jihad, aiming to construct a community under the Islamic precepts. Not only do drug cartels lack a doctrine that inspires and justifies their activities, but they are culturally divergent from those that inspire Islamic jihad. Even the so-called “acts of terror” carried out by the cartels simply represent a struggle of power within the drug system with no doctrine as background, and are not considered “sacred” in the way the Jihad is. In this sense, recruiting, cooperating or assimilating drug dealers in the terrorist organization would contradict its essence and goals and could be considered shameful and sinful for its members. Islamists cooperate with other Islamists because at the core of their organizations lies religion. Even this statement is generalist since the varied branches of Islam differ radically from each other making the differences between Shiites and Sunnites an obstacle in the memberships of such organizations. It could be argued that if one of the main objectives of Al Qaeda is the imposition of a moral code for life in community, the Cartel members’ lifestyle could be significantly contradictory and offensive to the principles of Islam. The violation to the integrity of the body that alcohol consumption, drug abuse and sexual activity represent is a core element of life in the Cartels, while it is considered sinful for adherents of Islam. Therefore, terrorists do not have the need (or desire) to cross the border disguised as Hispanics. Al Qaeda has demonstrated that they have followers and entire communities of supporters and sponsors throughout the world. Many of them are even known to reside inside the United States legally and illegally. It might be time to recognize that Al Qaeda does not need Hispanics, or any other predominant group of immigrants, to pursue its goals and carry out its agenda in the U.S or elsewhere. The imminent challenge that terrorist organizations pose to the State and rule of law today is alarming and dreadful. However, such a threat should by no means be entwined to establish an unrealistic relation to the immigration issue we are confronting today. It would be a shame that an accumulation of groundless hypothesis and conspiracy theories withheld the progress towards a comprehensive immigration reform.

#### 3. No Impact - Iranian terrorism originating in Mexico is extremely unlikely, even if the border is insecure Mexico will prevent an attack.

Johnson 2011  
Tim Johnson, McClatchy Newspapers “Mexico seen as unlikely launching pad for Iranian plot” 10/12/2011http://www.mcclatchydc.com/2011/10/12/127034/mexico-seen-as-unlikely-launching.html#storylink=cpy

MEXICO CITY — The alleged Iranian plot to assassinate Saudi Arabia's ambassador to the United States has cast Mexico into the news as a potential staging area for a terrorist operation. But experts say the likelihood of such a plot going undetected in Mexico by U.S. authorities is low and that Mexico's drug cartels would be unlikely to become involved. U.S. officials alleged Tuesday that an Iranian-American and a member of Iran's al Quds Force sought to enlist a Mexican drug cartel in a plot to kill Saudi Ambassador Adel al Jubeir in Washington, perhaps by bombing a restaurant he was known to frequent. One of the men, Manssor Arbabsiar, 56, a naturalized U.S. citizen holding Iranian and U.S. passports, was said to have met in the Mexican border city of Reynosa with a Drug Enforcement Administration informant who he thought was a member of a violent drug cartel. The barrage of 251,287 unredacted U.S. diplomatic cables that WikiLeaks released more than a month ago suggest that American diplomats maintain a steady focus on Iran's activities in Latin America. In Mexico, that meant keeping an eye on a mosque in Torreon, watching the impact of Iran's "dynamic" new ambassador, gauging public attitudes toward Iran and coaching agents at Mexico's National Security and Investigation Center — CISEN in its Spanish initials — the domestic intelligence agency. Strategic Forecasting Inc., an Austin, Texas, global intelligence firm commonly called Stratfor, on Wednesday described as unlikely any use of Mexico as a staging ground for a terrorist attack emanating from the Middle East. It noted that while the U.S.-Mexico border is porous and prone to security breaches, the U.S. government has "extremely active intelligence capabilities" embedded in Mexico. It added that Mexico is generally hostile to enemies of the United States, not wanting to risk possible intervention by U.S. forces should its territory be used in any attack.

## Ext. to Frontline Arguments

### Ext. 1NC #1 - Border Secure Now

#### The border is safer now than ever.

New York Times 2013   
Damien Cave for the New York Times 3/3/13 “Long Border, Endless Struggle” http://www.nytimes.com/2013/03/03/world/americas/border-security-hard-to-achieve-and-harder-to-measure.html?pagewanted=all&\_r=0

With a similar degree of omission, Republicans demanding more fencing rarely mention that here, along hundreds of miles of a twisting river border with farms and parks on its edge, such an approach would mean seizing private property, damaging the environment and spending billions.

It is increasingly clear to those who live along the boundary with Mexico — or who try to protect it — that there is no such thing as a completely secure border, just as there are no cities without crime. Even in areas with towering walls and drones or helicopters overhead, border security can be breached.

The international divide is not a line or a series of doors to be locked and guarded, they argue. It is more like a 2,000-mile shoreline with ever-changing currents of migration, legitimate trade and smuggler tactics. The challenge evolves season to season. In Texas, where the border moves with the flooding of the Rio Grande, smugglers have started using fake Halliburton trucks to drive through areas where the company services oil fields. In San Diego, a few hundred migrants a year now arrive by boat, while the imposing fences that cost $16 million per mile are regularly overcome with ladders rented out for $35 a climb.

“The U.S. border with Mexico is better controlled than at any time in our history,” said Robert C. Bonner, who served under President George W. Bush as the commissioner of the United States Customs and Border Protection. But, he said, there is a lack of understanding among policy makers and the public about the challenge. “The terrain can be quite different depending on what part of the border you are talking about, and there are different ways, different tactics really, that need to be brought into play,” he said. “And this requires almost mile-by-mile analysis.”

### Ext. 1NC #2 & 3: No Terrorism

#### Politifact disproves their impact – There is no credible evidence of a terrorist threat from Mexico.

Selby 2013  
W. Gardner Selby, chief political writer for the Austin American-Statesman. Politifact Texas PolitiFact Texas is a partnership of the Austin American-Statesman and PolitiFact.com, a Pulitzer Prize-winning Web site. “Louie Gohmert says al Qaeda has camps with drug cartels in Mexico” 4/23/13 http://www.politifact.com/texas/statements/2013/apr/23/louie-gohmert/louie-gohmert-says-al-qaeda-has-camps-drug-cartels/

Our ruling Gohmert told C-SPAN that al Qaeda has camps with the drug cartels in Mexico. Since 9/11, there has been occasional speculation about al Qaeda operatives crossing into the country from Mexico. Notably, too, Napolitano said in 2011 that the U.S. government has thought about what would happen if the Zetas united with al Qaeda. However, there appears to be no evidence of al Qaeda now having camps in Mexico, with the drug cartels or otherwise. According to experts, the groups that dominate drug trafficking will not put their businesses at risk. Mexican drug cartels deal in thousands of billions of dollars. They control territory where there is no government presence and they spread their tentacles across various countries. Neither do they hesitate to recruit illegal immigrants. They behead their victims. Willing souls? Question is, would they be interested in partnering with Iranian agents and al-Qaida terrorists to attack the other side of the Rio Grande? Last week, the U.S. government reported an alleged plot by Iranian government agents to assassinate Saudi Arabia’s ambassador in Washington with the supposed involvement of a Mexican cartel, presumably the most bloodthirsty of them all: The Zetas. On the other hand, several drug trafficking experts doubt the possibility that organized crime groups are interested in partnering with Islamic terrorists. A year and a half ago, the U.S. Embassy in Mexico rejected possible links between drug traffickers and Islamist terror cells. According to cables leaked by WikiLeaks, in a diplomatic dispatch in February 2010, the then-ambassador Carlos Pascual said, “No known international terrorist organization has an operational presence in Mexico, and neither have there been terrorist incidents directed against U.S. personnel or interests in Mexican territory, or originating from it.” Pascual resigned last March after the release of the cables expressed criticism towards Mexican President Felipe Calderon. According to the plot, which was denounced by the White House, Iranian citizen Manssor Arbabsiar, who is now detained, met several times with an alleged Mexican drug dealer who, in fact, was an undercover U.S. Drug Enforcement Agent. The Iranians, according to Washington’s same old story, offered their supposed Mexican partners a million and a half dollars for killing the Saudi diplomat. For Mexican writer and journalist Sergio González Rodríguez, author of several books on the phenomenon of organized crime, the bizarre story must be framed in the U.S. national security strategy for equating Mexican drug trafficking with terrorism.

#### Terrorism from the US-Mexico border is unlikely – best experts conclude

Selby 2013  
W. Gardner Selby, chief political writer for the Austin American-Statesman. Politifact Texas PolitiFact Texas is a partnership of the Austin American-Statesman and PolitiFact.com, a Pulitzer Prize-winning Web site. “Louie Gohmert says al Qaeda has camps with drug cartels in Mexico” 4/23/13 http://www.politifact.com/texas/statements/2013/apr/23/louie-gohmert/louie-gohmert-says-al-qaeda-has-camps-drug-cartels/

Our search of recent news accounts turned up nothing specific to al Qaeda camps in Mexico, though an Oct. 13, 2011, Agence France Press news story, datelined Mexico City, said that in February 2011, Janet Napolitano, the U.S. secretary of Homeland Security, had said U.S. authorities were concerned about a potential alliance between groups like al Qaeda and the Zetas, which the story described as the cartel "started by elite military brass who went bad to sell drugs." Napolitano mentioned the worry, according to the transcript of a Feb. 9, 2011, hearing of the House Committee on Homeland Security, after Rep. Blake Farenthold, R-Corpus Christi, said that he believed terrorists could exploit the international drug trade to the detriment of the United States. "Indeed," Napolitano replied. "And one of the things that -- all I will say in open setting is that we have for some time been thinking ahead about what would happen if, say, al Qaeda were to unite with the Zetas, one of the drug cartels. And I'll just leave it at that." The Agence France Press story also said that President Barack Obama said in July 2011 that the Zetas "were a threat to international security, comparing them to organized crime groups in Italy and Japan. But experts argued," the story said, that "it is one thing for the Zetas to indulge in cross-border business, and it is quite another for them to decide to take part in a terror strike that would directly challenge and confront the U.S. government." Experts say such camps unheard of - Next, several security experts on security issues each told us he was unaware of al Qaeda camps in Mexico. "Never heard this one before," replied Daniel Byman, a Georgetown University professor and the director of research at the Saban Center for Middle East Policy at the Brookings Institution. "This was a post 9/11 fear, but I never saw evidence for it. " By telephone, Daveed Gartenstein-Ross, a senior fellow at the Foundation for the Defense of Democracies, said that he would not discount border security, but Gohmert’s claim struck him as "incredibly sloppy. It doesn’t help the debate. We don’t know that these claims are true." Gartenstein-Ross offered, too, that it would be foolish for the drug cartels to let al Qaeda establish camps in their bailiwicks. The cartels, he said, "are out to make money. Right now, they have not drawn the (direct) wrath of the United States. If they had al Qaeda camps," he said, they’d draw U.S. military might. "There has been no credible report of al Qaeda having camps with the drug cartels," he said. Similarly, Brian Michael Jenkins, a RAND terrorism expert, said through an email that he has not seen any evidence to support the claim. A RAND colleague, political scientist Peter Chalk, separately said via email he had not heard of such camps in Mexico.

#### Cartels won’t ally with terrorists – visibility and terror are bad for business.

González-Calero 2011   
César González-Calero has spent his entire career working as a journalist in a range of publications in Spain and Latin America, including Diario 16, El Mundo, El País, Expansión, The Washington Post, El Universal, Cambio and Milenio. “Mexican Drug Cartels and Islamic Terrorism: An Unlikely Alliance” Translated By Robin Salomon 17 October 2011 Edited by Jen­nifer Pietropaoli La Nacion http://watchingamerica.com/News/126395/mexican-drug-cartels-and-islamic-terrorism-an-unlikely-alliance/

In addition to Gonzalez Rodriguez, other experts are outspoken about drug trafficking. Jose Reveles, author of such books as “Narcoméxico,” appeals to the “logic” of the cartels to reject alliances with Islamist terrorism. “The cartels operate in areas they know and where it is possible to escape; they are not suicidal, and it is not amongst their priorities to attack the United States.” Raul Benitez, a researcher at the Autonomous University of Mexico, concurs: “The cartels want to do their business in secret; that sort of visibility is not convenient for them.” Even U.S. intelligence and security consulting firm, Stratfor, which sides closer to the neoconservative ideology, considers it very unlikely that there would be an alliance between radical Islamists and drug traffickers, according to a report that came out last week, after complaints from the White House. For Stratfor, cartel cooperation with terrorist groups would jeopardize the modus operandi of these gangs because they would suffer reprisals from Washington. Mexican drug trade does not seem to need al-Qaida or any other Islamic organization to set foot in the U.S. It’s already present in over 1,000 cities, according to the U.S. Department of Justice. The business of cocaine, marijuana and methamphetamine remains buoyant. Why would it sink?

#### **Mexican cartels won’t work with terrorists; it would be bad for business.**

Johnson 2011  
Tim Johnson, McClatchy Newspapers “Mexico seen as unlikely launching pad for Iranian plot” 10/12/2011http://www.mcclatchydc.com/2011/10/12/127034/mexico-seen-as-unlikely-launching.html#storylink=cpy

The cartels, too, have pragmatic interests in maintaining their core business of narcotics smuggling without greater interference, it added. "Any plan to use Mexican drug cartels to carry out attacks against the United States would threaten the very existence of the cartel," a Stratfor analysis said. "Mexican drug cartels are already facing challenges — struggling with one another and with the Mexican government for control over transportation routes that will allow them to transit cocaine from South America to the United States. Any foray into international terrorism would be bad for business," Stratfor said. At least four U.S. diplomatic cables from 2008 and 2009 indicate how closely U.S. envoys in Mexico track Iranian activities.

## Extensions/Additional Answers

### A2 – Overstays

#### The affirmative cannot solve overstays – it would be a logistical nightmare. Existing laws are sufficient to deter overstays.

Alden 2013   
Edward Alden, a senior fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations, is the author of The Closing of the American Border: Terrorism, Immigration and Security Since 9/11. “Critics exaggerate holes in visa system” The Hill 05/20/13 http://thehill.com/opinion/op-ed/300841-critics-exaggerate-holes-in-visa-system

More routinely, the U.S. government revokes the visas of those who overstay, so that if they do leave the country, they will likely not be permitted to return. That creates a strong deterrent against casual overstayers. Holes certainly remain. The government should be notifying visa holders by email when their visas are set to expire to encourage compliance. The Senate bill would require an electronic exit system in which the passports of all departing passengers are swiped to avoid errors. The land borders still pose a logistical nightmare because of the high traffic volume. But the U.S. and Canada are solving that problem through information sharing. This June the two governments will start sharing entry and exit records for all third-country nationals, including permanent residents of Canada and the United States. This leaves the Mexican border, where it will be harder to share data due to poor infrastructure and information systems on the Mexican side. But there, too, gradual progress is being made. U.S. tracking of visa overstays is not perfect, but neither is it the massive hole in immigration enforcement that too many in Congress believe exists. A debate over the facts will help in crafting legislation that better secures the United States against criminals, terrorists and ordinary immigration-law violators.

#### Overstays are decreasing now and new visa requirements deter illegal visa use.

Alden 2013   
Edward Alden, a senior fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations, is the author of The Closing of the American Border: Terrorism, Immigration and Security Since 9/11. “Critics exaggerate holes in visa system” The Hill 05/20/13 http://thehill.com/opinion/op-ed/300841-critics-exaggerate-holes-in-visa-system

No part of the immigration reform debate is more misunderstood than the issue of those who have overstayed visas. Critics of the Senate Gang of Eight’s proposal say little has been done since the 9/11 terrorist attacks to plug a loophole that has allowed millions to remain in the United States illegally. Sen. John Cornyn (R-Texas) said recently that despite a 1996 law that requires an “entry-exit” system to catch overstayers, “the exit system is nonfunctional.” In fact, the number of visa overstays has plummeted in the past decade as successive administrations have made real progress in tightening the visa system. The additional requirement in the Senate bill for fully electronic exit at all airports and seaports within five years is a sensible addition to solving a chronic problem that is gradually being brought under control. Temporary visas are issued for many purposes, but all require that a foreign tourist, student or other visa holder return home when the duration of his or her lawful visit expires. Historically, however, the United States has never known whether visa holders actually left, and many did not.

### Turn – Trade increases Illicit Drugs

#### Trucks = drugs

Reuters 2012  
 ”U.S. transport companies cash in on Mexico trade boom” http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/12/04/us-usa-transports-mexico-idUSBRE8B307020121204

Along with the boom in business come dangers. Companies with operations in Mexico must deal with the ongoing drug war. Kansas City Southern posts guards on trains in high-risk areas and scans cargo as trains cross the border.

But most of the problems are on the roads. The Mexican Council on Northeast Foreign Trade, a private trade association, said 85 percent of illegal goods sent from Mexico to the United States were found in trucks.

A federal police officer who requested anonymity said it was a very big problem with life-and-death consequences. "Truckers in Tamaulipas state and Monterrey are often threatened with death if they don't transport what they're told to transport, drugs above all," the police official said.

# Solvency

## 1NC FL – Solvency

#### 1. Turn - coordination of point of entry infrastructure between the US and Mexico fails and makes congestion worse.

Regan 2011   
Sean Regan Commander, U.S. Coast Guard NAVAL WAR COLLEGE U.S. – MEXICO POLICY COORDINATION AN ASSESSMENT OF THE TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY BORDER POLICY COORDINATION EFFORT A paper submitted to the Faculty of the Naval War College in partial satisfaction of the requirements of the Department of Joint Military Operations. 2011 http://www.dtic.mil/dtic/tr/fulltext/u2/a555536.pdf

The Policy Coordination Challenge Bureaucracies on both sides of the border struggle to coordinate policies across and within various levels of government including federal, state, and local structures. However, the complexity and interdependence of bi-national issues means there is rarely a clear, single lead department or agency on any given issue on either side of the border. Complicating coordination efforts are the various and often duplicative authorities held by many U.S. and GoM institutions. In addition, the various bi-national interactions at the federal, state, and local levels are often not apparent to the other levels of government. The different government stakeholders often address issues directly and indirectly through bi-lateral institutions, commissions, and agreements.7 The failure to coordinate efforts results in disjointed border policies and activities leading to increased levels of congestion, delay, higher border-crossing costs, and insufficient infrastructure planning. One example of a disjointed effort can be found at coordination related to the establishment and management of land ports of entry (POEs).8 The United States and Mexico have over seven federal departments within each national-level structure with POE-related responsibilities.9

#### 2. No Solvency – Mexico says no - the new Nieto administration in Mexico is less likely to cooperate with the US on security measures

O’Neil 4/29/13  
Shannon O'Neil is Senior Fellow for Latin America Studies at the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR), an independent, nonpartisan membership organization, think tank, and publisher. She holds a BA from Yale University, an MA in International Relations from Yale University, and a PhD in Government from Harvard University. “Obama Heads to Mexico” Latin America’s Moment http://blogs.cfr.org/oneil/2013/04/29/obama-heads-to-mexico/

Yet no less important for the two neighbors is security. Under Felipe Calderón’s administration, more than 70,000 Mexicans were killed and many more disappeared in violence related to drugs and organized crime. Regular crime, too, has risen, with 40 percent of Mexicans in a recent survey reporting that they or a family member had been a victim of a crime in the past year. This growing crisis opened the door to greater bilateral efforts. After years of cautious circling, U.S.-Mexico security cooperation — through the Mérida Initiative and other efforts — blossomed, setting the two neighbors on a different and more collaborative path.

On this policy front, the direction Peña Nieto’s government plans to take is less clear. While repeatedly promising to reduce violence, the details of his administration’s security plan remain vague — suggesting more spending on prevention and social programs. Even the concrete shifts announced — for instance, creating a new federal gendarmerie — have been clouded by contradictory explanations and timelines. The efforts to recentralize the security apparatus by bringing the autonomous Federal Police back under the control of the Ministry of Interior still await the definition of basic reporting lines and the stamp of a finally confirmed executive secretary of the national public security system charged with coordinating security efforts (an area where the previous government struggled). Finally, the leaders of this side of Peña Nieto’s government — Osorio Chong, ex-governor of Hidalgo; Manuel Mondragón y Kalb, the deputy secretary of public safety and previously Mexico City’s top cop; and Jesús Murillo Karam, Mexico’s attorney general and also an ex-governor of Hidalgo — are less familiar to the United States, and some worry less open to working with their neighbor than their predecessors.

To be fair, security is harder. After more than a decade of underperformance, most Mexicans agree on what needs to be done economically. In contrast, there is no ready security blueprint for the way forward, for what will work to make Mexico — and by extension the United States — safer. And the issues on which there is some consensus — cleaning up Mexico’s police forces and courts and expanding programs to help youths and communities at risk — were started under the Calderón administration, making it a tricky sell for a government trying to differentiate itself.

For Obama, the challenge this week will be to push forward on both fronts, recognizing and embracing the economic ambitions while also ensuring that security cooperation doesn’t falter. What really matters is what happens after the visit and how the U.S. government works with all of these elements and directions in Peña Nieto’s Cabinet. Because the outcome matters — as no other country affects the United States on a day-to-day basis as much as Mexico.

## Ext. to Frontline Arguments

### Ext. 1NC #1: Coordination Fails/Bad

#### The affirmative conflates border security and transportation efficiency which kills implementation.

Regan 2011   
Sean Regan Commander, U.S. Coast Guard NAVAL WAR COLLEGE U.S. – MEXICO POLICY COORDINATION AN ASSESSMENT OF THE TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY BORDER POLICY COORDINATION EFFORT A paper submitted to the Faculty of the Naval War College in partial satisfaction of the requirements of the Department of Joint Military Operations. 2011 http://www.dtic.mil/dtic/tr/fulltext/u2/a555536.pdf

Prior to attempting bi-national coordination, obtaining consensus on priority efforts at the federal inter-agency level must occur. The United States’ inter-agency policy and coordination processes focus on the development of whole-of-government approaches to issues. However, security-focused agencies, customs-focused agencies, and transportation focused agencies each have different mandates and nomenclature. This can lead to confusion on which priority topic the federal agencies should be focused on: security, infrastructure, or throughput. Confused, disjointed, and unclear priorities interfere with efforts to get Congressional funding that promotes focused cross-border progress.

#### And, working cooperatively with Mexico fails – their government’s bureaucracy fails.

Regan 2011   
Sean Regan Commander, U.S. Coast Guard NAVAL WAR COLLEGE U.S. – MEXICO POLICY COORDINATION AN ASSESSMENT OF THE TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY BORDER POLICY COORDINATION EFFORT A paper submitted to the Faculty of the Naval War College in partial satisfaction of the requirements of the Department of Joint Military Operations. 2011 http://www.dtic.mil/dtic/tr/fulltext/u2/a555536.pdf

The structure of the GoM’s departments and agencies is similarly complex with border and national security responsibilities split between the president and eight cabinet departments. Efforts are often duplicated across agencies because roles, responsibilities, and authority are not clearly defined.11 Ambiguous, shifting, and overlapping responsibilities have also led to uncoordinated efforts (and often animosity) between Mexican federal agencies. While overlapping roles in the GoM federal structure may provide some checks and balances across agencies, more often it leads to confusion in both the United States and GoM with regard to authority, roles, responsibilities, and which department should coordinate with what department.

\*GoM = Government of Mexico

## Extensions/Additional Answers

### Emissions Turn

#### Increased land traffic at the border massively increases greenhouse gas emissions -

Blank & Lee 2009  
 Transportation infrastructure and competitiveness (revision July 1, 2009) Report prepared for the Woodrow Wilson Center Mexico Institute and El Colegio de la Frontera Norte research project, “The U.S.-Mexico Border: A Discussion on Sub-National Policy Options” By Stephen Blank and Erik Lee

Impact on the environment: GHG emissions¶ Environmental concerns along the US-Mexico border since the signing of NAFTA focused mainly on water pollution, industrial waste, chemical degradation and so on. But the critical issue now is climate change. The border – border crossings and trade corridors in particular – is a major source of green house gas (GHG) emissions. Increasing pressure to mitigate GHG emissions at border crossings and trade corridors will be a major shaping factor on border policy and could become a significant force in “thinning” the border.¶ Trucks accounted for much the largest share of the greatly expanded flow of goods moving across North America’s internal borders in the 1980s and ‘90s. Rail traffic increased substantially as well, but the modal balance between rail and truck – 30% by rail and 70% by truck – did not change. The number of commercial trucks on US highways (most powered by diesel engines) increased by nearly 40% between 1980 and 2002.4 (This is US data. The Mexican modal balance in freight transport tips even more toward trucks.)¶ The growth in truck transport has led to a less environmentally-friendly environment.5 Road transport is a heavy user of energy and a heavy generator of emissions of nitrogen oxide (NOx) and particulate matters (PM), increasing environmental pressures already associated with combustion. Most forms of transport have a large carbon footprint as well.6¶ Because NAFTA truck traffic has been concentrated at border regions and along trade corridors, increasing pressure has been put on infrastructure capacity particularly at border crossings and on the environment. This has transformed some communities into “high impact locales—places where environmental pressures (have) concentrated to overwhelm the available supports”7

### Infrastructure No Solve

#### Infrastructure improvements aren’t sufficient – new staffing is needed

Gonzalez 2012   
Testimony of Jose D. Gonzalez Chairman of the Board Laredo Licensed U.S. Customs Broker Association May 1, 2012 Use of Technology to Facilitate Trade and Enhance Security at our Ports of Entry Before the 112th Congress Committee on Homeland Security Subcommittee on Border and Maritime Security U.S. House of Representatives <http://homeland.house.gov/sites/homeland.house.gov/files/Testimony-Gonzalez.pdf>

CBP Officers at the Port of Laredo do an incredible job of keeping our country safe. I had an opportunity ¶ to go behind the scenes and get an introduction into the training and technology that CBP Officers' utilize ¶ to do their job effectively and efficiently when I participated in the inaugural eight week CBP Field ¶ Operations Citizens Academy last year and I was thoroughly impressed at how much CBP Officers do ¶ and how quickly they do it. Searching for alternatives to reduce delays while increasing security at the ¶ Port of Laredo for commercial traffic is not an easy task. Regardless of how well CBP Officers are doing¶ given their resources, I believe that there is always an opportunity to improve - especially with additional ¶ funding for technology and personnel.¶ ADDITIONAL INFRASTRUCTURE REQUIRES ADDITIONAL PERSONNEL¶

In May 2011, seven new primary inspection booths for commercial traffic were opened, nearly doubling ¶ the capacity at the World Trade Bridge. With a total of 15 primary inspection booths and improvements to ¶ the secondary express and exit gate areas, the World Trade Bridge has the infrastructure to handle a ¶ record number of shipments. The improvements to the infrastructure can only be fully utilized with ¶ additional CBP Officers. Additional personnel are needed now because northbound traffic currently peaks ¶ between about 9 am to nearly 4pm every day during the week.

### Regulatory Probs

#### Different regulatory regimes impede trade – differences in cargo liability and truck weight limits make efficient trans-border shipping difficult

Harrington 2013   
“U.S.—Mexico Trade: Two-Way Traffic” January Inbound Logistics Lisa H. Harrington Supply chain management consultant, professor, research center associate director, University of Maryland, Robert H. Smith School of Business http://www.inboundlogistics.com/cms/article/us-mexico-trade-two-way-traffic/

A second border-related issue affecting U.S.-Mexico supply chains is the disparity in the legal and regulatory regimes of the two countries. One example is cargo liability.¶ In handling border crossings, Mexican customs brokers are liable for comparing the physical freight to the documentation to make sure they match, and for deciding classification and duty rates for goods crossing the border. If any issues or discrepancies arise, the Mexican broker can face penalties or lose its license.¶ "Mexican brokers often stop the freight, unload the trailer, and inspect the goods," Ryley says. "That takes time. Less-than-truckload (LTL) shipments from all over the United States get trapped by customs brokers on the border, waiting to be consolidated into truckload shipments." This unloading and re-loading, with interim warehousing, make exporting to Mexico more complex.¶ Another regulatory impediment that adds cost to cross-border trade is truck weight limits. "Truck weight limits are not harmonized among the three NAFTA countries," explains Sonney Jones, director of transportation at Dal-Tile, a Dallas-based subsidiary of Mohawk Industries that manufactures ceramic tile products in several countries. "Canada and Mexico allow 25 metric tons; the U.S. limit is approximately 20 metric tons. This impacts the cost of moving goods in Mexico and Canada, because loads have to comply with the U.S. limit to cross the border. It costs Dal-Tile an additional $1 million in transportation to send shipments the 145 miles between Monterrey and Laredo at the U.S. weight instead of the Mexican weight."¶ If the three NAFTA countries all allowed 25-metric-ton capacity, freight could move seamlessly, and the cost and capacity benefits would be significant.¶

Changing U.S. truck weight limits is a daunting challenge, however. The trucking industry has lobbied Washington for heavier trucks for years, but the rail industry opposes the change, fearing freight diversion.

# Offcase

## States CP

### States CP 1NC

#### The 50 states and territories of the United States should fund substantial infrastructure improvements at Points of Entry along the United States – Mexico border.

#### States and localities could fund POE improvements – only minor changes at the federal level would be required

Wilson & Lee 2013  
 Erik Lee, Associate Director at the North American Center for Transborder Studies (NACTS) at Arizona State University, Christopher E. Wilson, Associate at the Mexico Institute of the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars “THE STATE OF TRADE, COMPETITIVENESS AND ECONOMIC WELL-BEING INTHE U.S.-MEXICO BORDER REGION” The State of The Border report: A Comprehensive Analysis of the U.S.-Mexico Border Border Research Partnership May 2013 <http://www.wilsoncenter.org/sites/default/files/mexico_state_of_border.pdf>

Given the fact that POE improvements offer significant and tangible monetary benefits to border communities and trade-dependent industries, state, local and private entities are often willing to contribute funding to border infrastructure projects. Under the current budgetary constraints, it makes sense for federal agencies to take full advantage of these alternative funding sources. Along the Texas-Mexico border, the majority of POEs are owned by the city or county in which they are located. This model for infrastructure investment could be expanded along other parts of the U.S.-Mexico border, but changes to current federal legislation appear to be necessary to allow CBP to “accept reimbursement from sources other than Congress.”17 As demonstrated above, additional staffing is and will be increasingly necessary as trade increases. With the active support of border stakeholders across the region, a proposal along these lines designed in collaboration with federal agencies could likely garner legislative support and could open significant opportunities for investment despite tough budgetary times.

### Ext: CP Solves/Causes Plan

#### State action solves – greater state initiative leads to national level policy realignment

Gerber et al. 2010   
James Gerber, PhD California Davis San Diego State University Director of the Center for Latin American Studies (CLAS) and a Professor of Economics;Francisco Lara-Valencia , PhD Umich, Arizona State University Associate Professor, Director, Research Network for Transborder Development and Governance; Carlos de la Parra, El Colegio de la Frontera Norte, PhD Umich, professor Urban and Environmental Studies at El Colegio de la Frontera Norte. “Re-Imagining the U.S.-Mexico Border: Policies toward a More Competitive and Sustainable Transborder Region” Global Economy Journal Volume 10, Issue 4 2010

The trajectory toward crossborder integration and the increasing political maturity of the ten border states are the underpinnings of the term “transborder,” as we use it here and as it being use by the Border Governors Conference. The Border Governors Conference launched in 2009 a set of Strategic Guidelines, or Plan Indicativo, in an attempt to define policies for the U.S.-Mexico border region as a whole as well as to have a greater voice in the future of overall U.S.- Mexico relations. We argue that this claim to an increased voice in national policies for border states will tend towards a greater partnership between national and regional interests, rather than promoting a tug-of-war between border states and national capitals. Regional-national partnership is essential, both for the social and economic development of the border region, and for the strengthening of U.S.-Mexico ties.

#### Uniform state action is good – induces national coordination and action

Gerber, Lara-Valencia & de la Parra 2010

Gerber et al 10  
James Gerber, PhD California Davis San Diego State University Director of the Center for Latin American Studies (CLAS) and a Professor of Economics;Francisco Lara-Valencia , PhD Umich, Arizona State University Associate Professor, Director, Research Network for Transborder Development and Governance; Carlos de la Parra, El Colegio de la Frontera Norte, PhD Umich, professor Urban and Environmental Studies at El Colegio de la Frontera Norte. “Re-Imagining the U.S.-Mexico Border: Policies toward a More Competitive and Sustainable Transborder Region” Global Economy Journal Volume 10, Issue 4 2010

In the context of these challenges, together with deepening cross-border¶ demographic, social, and economic ties, the need for a common vision is¶ increased rather than diminished. The relevance of this vision for the region—¶ and its articulation as a bi-national policy framework—cannot be overstated. As¶ shown by Papademetriou and Meyers (2001), border communities are more likely¶ to influence national policies when they speak about their needs and opportunities¶ with a common voice. In addition, at the local level, a shared image of the future¶ of the border region is necessary for the articulation of clear and actionable goals¶ and for the creation of guidelines that encourage the engagement of public,¶ private and social actors in policy making and collective action.

## Disads – Politics

### Politics Link – Immigration

#### Current US border-security strategy built on deference – engagement risks opening up huge fights due to encroachments from Obama and Nieto

Fox 5/3/13 (“Obama, Peña Nieto Talk Shift In Security Cooperation”, <http://latino.foxnews.com/latino/politics/2013/05/03/obama-pena-nieto-talk-shift-in-security-cooperation/>, CMR)

But being careful not to intrude on the southern neighbor's sovereignty, Obama noted that Mexicans have the right to determine how best to tackle the violence that has plagued their country. He spoke during a press conference Thursday with Mexican President Enrique Peña Nieto.¶ Since taking office in December, Peña Nieto has moved to end the widespread access that U.S. security agencies have had in Mexico to tackle the violence that affects both sides of the border. It's a departure from the strategy employed by his predecessor, Felipe Calderon, which was praised by the U.S. but reviled by many Mexicans.¶ "I agreed to continue our close cooperation on security, even as the nature of that cooperation will evolve," Obama said during a joint news conference at Mexico's grand National Palace. "It is obviously up to the Mexican people to determine their security structures and how it engages with the other nations — including the United States."¶ Peña Nieto also downplayed the notion that the new, more centralized arrangement would damage its security partnership with the United States. He said Obama agreed during their private meeting earlier in the day to "cooperate on the basis of mutual respect" to promote an efficient and effective strategy.¶ Obama arrived in Mexico Thursday afternoon for a three-day trip that includes a stop in Costa Rica on Friday. Domestic issues followed the president south of the border, with Obama facing questions in his exchange with reporters about the potential escalation of the U.S. role in Syria, a controversy over contraception access for teenage girls, and the delicate debate on Capitol Hill on an immigration overhaul.¶ The latter issue is being closely watched in Mexico, given the large number of Mexicans who have emigrated to the U.S. both legally and illegally. More than half of the 11 million people in the U.S. illegally are Mexican, according to the Pew Research Center.¶ For Obama, the immigration debate is rife with potential political pitfalls. While he views an overhaul of the nation's patchwork immigration laws as a legacy-building issue, he's been forced to keep a low-profile role in the debate to avoid scaring off wary Republicans.¶ In an effort to court those GOP lawmakers, the draft bill being debated on Capitol Hill focuses heavily on securing the border with Mexico, and makes doing so a pre-condition for a pathway to citizenship for those in the U.S. illegally. But Florida Republican Sen. Marco Rubio, one of the bill's architects, said Thursday that unless the border security measures are made even tougher, the legislation will face tough odds not only in the GOP-controlled House but also in the Democratic-led Senate.¶ The president acknowledged there were some areas along the 2,000-mile border between the U.S. and Mexico where security needs to be tightened. But he gently chided Rubio and other Republicans for putting up obstacles that would derail final legislation.¶ "I suspect that the final legislation will not contain everything I want. It won't contain everything that Republican leaders want, either," Obama said. He added that "what I'm not going to do is to go along with something where we're looking for an excuse not to do it as opposed to a way to do it."¶ Despite the intense interest in the immigration debate among Mexicans, Peña Nieto carefully avoided injecting himself in the issue. While he commended the U.S. for tackling the challenge, he said the congressional debate "is a domestic affair."¶ The new Mexican leader was purposely seeking to avoid the perceived missteps of former Mexican President Vicente Fox, who irked conservatives in the U.S. by lobbying for an immigration overhaul in 2001.¶ Peña Nieto's election brought Mexico's Institutional Revolutionary Party, or PRI, back to power after a decade on the sidelines. The security changes are emblematic of the party's preference for centralized political and bureaucratic control.¶ The arrangement means all contact for U.S. law enforcement will now go through a "single door," according to Mexico's federal Interior Ministry, the agency that controls security and domestic policy. Under the previous policy, FBI, CIA, DEA and Homeland Security had direct access to units of Mexico's Federal Police, army and navy. ¶ U.S. agents worked side by side with those Mexican units in the fight against drug cartels, including the U.S.-backed strategy of killing or arresting top kingpins.¶ Obama lauded his Mexican counterpart for launching bold reforms during his first months in office, not only on security but also the economy. Both leaders have said they want to refocus the U.S.-Mexico relationship on trade and the economy, not the drug wars and immigration issues that have dominated the partnership in recent years.

#### The plan derails immigration reform

Shear, 13 (Michael, NYT White house correspondent, 5/5, <http://www.nytimes.com/2013/05/05/world/americas/in-latin-america-us-shifts-focus-from-drug-war-to-economy.html?pagewanted=all>, CMR)

Last week, Mr. Obama returned to capitals in Latin America with a vastly different message. Relationships with countries racked by drug violence and organized crime should focus more on economic development and less on the endless battles against drug traffickers and organized crime capos that have left few clear victors. The countries, Mexico in particular, need to set their own course on security, with the United States playing more of a backing role. That approach runs the risk of being seen as kowtowing to governments more concerned about their public image than the underlying problems tarnishing it. Mexico, which is eager to play up its economic growth, has mounted an aggressive effort to play down its crime problems, going as far as to encourage the news media to avoid certain slang words in reports. “The problem will not just go away,” said Michael Shifter, president of the Inter-American Dialogue. “It needs to be tackled head-on, with a comprehensive strategy that includes but goes beyond stimulating economic growth and alleviating poverty. “Obama becomes vulnerable to the charge of downplaying the region’s overriding issue, and the chief obstacle to economic progress,” he added. “It is fine to change the narrative from security to economics as long as the reality on the ground reflects and fits with the new story line.” Administration officials insist that Mr. Obama remains cleareyed about the security challenges, but the new emphasis corresponds with a change in focus by the Mexican government. The new Mexican president, Enrique Peña Nieto, took office in December vowing to reduce the violence that exploded under the militarized approach to the drug war adopted by his predecessor, Felipe Calderón. That effort left about 60,000 Mexicans dead and appears not to have significantly damaged the drug-trafficking industry. In addition to a focus on reducing violence, which some critics have interpreted as taking a softer line on the drug gangs, Mr. Peña Nieto has also moved to reduce American involvement in law enforcement south of the border. With friction and mistrust between American and Mexican law enforcement agencies growing, Mr. Obama suggested that the United States would no longer seek to dominate the security agenda. “It is obviously up to the Mexican people to determine their security structures and how it engages with other nations, including the United States,” he said, standing next to Mr. Peña Nieto on Thursday in Mexico City. “But the main point I made to the president is that we support the Mexican government’s focus on reducing violence, and we look forward to continuing our good cooperation in any way that the Mexican government deems appropriate.” In some ways, conceding leadership of the drug fight to Mexico hews to a guiding principle of Mr. Obama’s foreign policy, in which American supremacy is played down, at least publicly, in favor of a multilateral approach. But that philosophy could collide with the concerns of lawmakers in Washington, who have expressed frustration with what they see as a lack of clarity in Mexico’s security plans. And security analysts say the entrenched corruption in Mexican law enforcement has long clouded the partnership with their American counterparts. Putting Mexico in the driver’s seat on security marks a shift in a balance of power that has always tipped to the United States and, analysts said, will carry political risk as Congress negotiates an immigration bill that is expected to include provisions for tighter border security. “If there is a perception in the U.S. Congress that security cooperation is weakening, that could play into the hands of those who oppose immigration reform,” said Vanda Felbab-Brown, a counternarcotics expert at the Brookings Institution in Washington. “Realistically, the border is as tight as could be and there have been few spillovers of the violence from Mexico into the U.S.,” she added, but perceptions count in Washington “and can be easily distorted.” “Drugs today are not very important to the U.S. public over all,” she added, “but they are important to committed drug warriors who are politically powerful.” Representative Michael T. McCaul, a Texas Republican who is chairman of the Homeland Security Committee, has warned against the danger of drug cartels forming alliances with terrorist groups. “While these threats exist, you would be surprised to find that the administration thinks its work here is done,” he wrote in an opinion article for Roll Call last month, pressing for more border controls in the bill. The Obama administration has said any evidence of such cooperation is very thin, but even without terrorist connections, drug gangs pose threats to peace and security. Human rights advocates said they feared the United States would ease pressure on Mexico to investigate disappearances and other abuses at the hands of the police and military, who have received substantial American support. The shift in approach “suggests that the Obama administration either doesn’t object to these abusive practices or is only willing to raise such concerns when it’s politically convenient,” said José Miguel Vivanco, director of Human Rights Watch’s Americas division. Still, administration officials have said there may have been an overemphasis on the bellicose language and high-profile hunts for cartel leaders while the real problem of lawlessness worsens. American antidrug aid is shifting more toward training police and shoring up judicial systems that have allowed criminals to kill with impunity in Mexico and Central America. United States officials said Mr. Obama remains well aware of the region’s problems with security, even as he is determined that they not overshadow the economic opportunities. It is clear Mr. Obama, whatever his words four years ago, now believes there has been too much security talk. In a speech to Mexican students on Friday, Mr. Obama urged people in the two countries to look beyond a one-dimensional focus on what he called real security concerns, saying it is “time for us to put the old mind-sets aside.” And he repeated the theme later in the day in Costa Rica, lamenting that when it comes to the United States and Central America, “so much of the focus ends up being on security.” “We also have to recognize that problems like narco-trafficking arise in part when a country is vulnerable because of poverty, because of institutions that are not working for the people, because young people don’t see a brighter future ahead,” Mr. Obama said in a news conference with Laura Chinchilla, the president of Costa Rica.

### Politics Link – AT: Link Turns

#### No link turns – Politically charged debate crowds-out perceived benefits

Stratfor 5/2/13 (“Evolving U.S.-Mexico Relations and Obama's Visit”, <http://www.stratfor.com/analysis/evolving-us-mexico-relations-and-obamas-visit>, CMR)

Security Cooperation and Centralization¶ Pena Nieto's predecessor, the National Action Party's Felipe Calderon, focused heavily on Mexico's security challenges and oversaw the sustained military offensive against criminal organizations throughout the country. Pena Nieto has yet to elaborate much on his plans to address the security issues, but he has emphasized the need to combat street violence and kidnappings, while playing down the importance of combating drug trafficking -- a U.S. priority.¶ But ahead of Obama's visit, certain details have emerged indicating that the Pena Nieto administration intends to change the nature of intelligence cooperation between the United States and Mexico. Until now, the two countries' various law enforcement and intelligence agencies have been able to interact directly, but Mexico's interior ministry will begin overseeing all intelligence collaboration.¶ This centralization effort has not been isolated to cooperation with the United States. The Mexican Interior Ministry has also taken charge of the federal police, and Pena Nieto intends to eventually create a national gendarmarie under the interior secretariat in order to fill the role in the drug wars currently played by the Mexican military with a security body better equipped with law enforcement training.¶ Thus, the extent and manner to which this centralization will affect security cooperation with the United States is unclear. But the changes are primarily designed to give Mexico greater control over the intelligence process involved in combating the country's violent gangs. The intention is not to block U.S. collaboration and assistance, but rather to reform existing structures.¶ Domestic Issues, Bilateral Implications¶ While Mexico reorients its internal focus to structural changes that its leaders hope will lay foundations for economic development, the country could also be affected by domestic issues under debate in the United States. For years, Mexico has been pressing the United States to enact stricter gun laws. Though a prominent gun control bill failed in the U.S. Senate on April 17, the issue will likely re-emerge later in 2013, and at least some gun control measures currently enjoy broad popular support. Meanwhile, demographic changes in the United States are driving a debate about immigration reform that, if implemented, would require collaboration with Mexico, many of whose citizens would seek to legalize their residential status in the United States.¶ Though the passage of these reforms will similarly be determined solely by U.S. domestic political factors, their success would be a significant boon for bilateral relations with Mexico. Indeed, for Obama and Pena Nieto, the effects each feel of the other's policy decisions will be magnified by the unique demographic, geographic and economic ties binding their countries. Yet, the domestic environment and political calculations in each country will ultimately shape the effects of this period of political change.¶ The U.S. political decision-making process is largely isolated from international influence, and the Pena Nieto administration likewise appears to be consolidating key policy areas under Mexican control at the expense of U.S. influence. Still, Mexico's steady emergence as an economic power in North America sets the stage for a bilateral relationship much more heavily focused on opportunities for economic cooperation.

### Politics Link - PC

#### Engaging Mexico drains PC

Farnsworth 12 – VP of the Council of the Americas and Americas Society (Eric, “The United States and Mexico: The Path Forward”, Nov 30, <http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/security/news/2012/11/30/46430/the-united-states-and-mexico-the-path-forward/>, CMR)

The election of Enrique Peña Nieto and the re-election of President Obama mean that the U.S.-Mexican relationship has a unique opportunity to grow closer and bring numerous benefits to both sides of the border. To fully appreciate this unique opportunity, both sides must invest political capital and be prepared to engage domestic public opinion when it comes to explaining why our countries are united by much more than a fence.

#### Real changes require PC – failed rhetorical commitments prove

Corcoran 9 (Patrick, “Shift in Tone Not Enough for U.S.-Mexico Relations”, April 16, <http://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/3618/shift-in-tone-not-enough-for-u-s-mexico-relations>, CMR)

But while the shift in tone is laudable, the impact of rhetoric alone will be limited in both duration and depth. Unfortunately, while Obama's team has reinforced cooperative security measures already in place to help Mexico battle against drug cartels, it has remained unwilling to commit to more fundamental changes in U.S. policy. Among such possible transformations to the bilateral status quo, two U.S. legislative initiatives stand out for the impact they might have on the drug war in Mexico. ¶ First, the Obama administration should pursue a new ban on assault weapons, much like the one that expired in 2004, but without the loopholes that allowed slightly modified machine guns to qualify as legal. Since Mexico is already overrun with weapons, such a ban wouldn't drive violence down overnight, and the larger criminal organizations would still be able to find willing suppliers elsewhere. However, a strengthened ban would force drug gangs to divert a larger proportion of their profits to weapons purchases, which would make it harder for smaller groups to stockpile arsenals. It would also eventually reduce the number of weapons in the country, making Mexico less prone to outbreaks of warfare between criminal gangs. However, when asked about a new ban last month on Face the Nation, Obama demurred.¶ Second, the Obama administration should seek the legalization of marijuana, which remains the most profitable source of revenue for Mexican smugglers. Polls show that close to half of the U.S. public favors the move, which would have a greater direct impact on the profitability of Mexico's drug gangs than any other single action. A growing chorus of mainstream analysts, including Time's Joe Klein and the Washington Post's Eugene Robinson, has also called for the regulated, legal sale of cannabis in recent weeks. ¶ Yet, when questioned about the possibility of legalizing marijuana at his recent online town hall meeting, Obama -- who has himself admitted to having smoked marijuana -- poked fun at those interested in the issue before summarily dismissing it. The context of the War on Drugs, which demonizes all discussions of legalization, might make such a reaction good politics. But it remains poor policy. ¶ In other realms, Obama has been similarly timid. He has been unwilling to expend political capital to renew a program that would allow Mexican trucks to traverse U.S. roads, much to the dismay of Mexican exporters and NAFTA supporters. More significantly, while Obama has ratcheted up his rhetoric on immigration reform, it remains at best the third-highest priority on his domestic agenda. ¶ All of this means that despite the wave of Mexican enthusiasm for the new U.S. government and the tone it has struck, the bilateral relationship won't differ fundamentally from that under former presidents George W. Bush and Bill Clinton. While Obama and his administration deserve credit for reappropriating the terms of the bilateral conversation, his administration shouldn't be surprised if Mexico soon loses its infatuation with attractive rhetoric wrapped around the same old problems.

#### The plan is politically unpopular.

Wilson May 2013   
Christopher E. Wilson Associate at the Mexico Institute of the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, where he develops the Institute’s research and programming on regional economic integration and U.S.-Mexico border affairs. “A U.S.-Mexico Economic Alliance: Policy Options for a Competitive Region” in New Ideas for a New Era: Policy Options for the Next Stage in U.S.-Mexico Relations Woodrow Wilson Center Mexico Institute Print Edition, <http://www.wilsoncenter.org/sites/default/files/new_ideas_new_era.pdf>, CMR

Improving policy requires surmounting political opposition. Past advances in U.S.- Mexico economic relations such as the passage of NAFTA were won not only by the political leadership in both countries, but also by the coalition of business groups and other non-governmental actors. The business communities of the United States and Mexico are natural allies for any effort to implement the type of competitiveness enhancing policies described above, but the networks forged during the passage of NAFTA virtually disappeared. Efforts should be made to strengthen the networks of U.S. and Mexican businesses and civil society groups working to support a positive and productive U.S.- Mexico partnership.

### Immigration Bill solves aff

#### Gang of Eight immigration bill solves – increases border staffing and facilitates trade

Ramos 2013  
Kristian Ramos is the New Democracy Network’s Policy Director of the 21st Century Border Initiative, he also works on Immigration, Hispanic Demographics and the Southwest Border, “Reason for optimism on border section of immigration legislation” May 19, 2013.http://www.voxxi.com/reason-border-immigration-legislation/#ixzz2UhG1f9Gq

Border Communities Are Safe: Since 2002 our immigration enforcement budget has tripled from $6.2 billion to $18 billion in 2012. We have already seen significant improvement in staffing between our ports of entry that has resulted in a reduction in violent crime along the 11 largest cities along our southern border. This increase in personnel has also resulted in an increase in apprehension rates in high traffic crossing areas. A December report from the Government Accountability Office reported that of the Border Patrol’s nine southwest-border sectors, five had more than 30,000 apprehensions in fiscal 2011, making them a “high traffic” corridor. Of these five, San Diego, CA had a 92 percent apprehension rate, El Centro, CA 91 percent, Tucson, AZ 87 percent, Laredo, TX 84 percent and the Rio Grande corridor in Texas was 71 percent. As such the Senate legislation acknowledges these gains in security by balancing enforcement and economic investment in the region.

The U.S.-Mexico relationship is essentially a commercial one: For years the U.S. has viewed our relationship through the prism, today while there are certainly security issues on the Mexico side of the border, there is now an equally compelling economic story to be told. In a new NDN/New Policy Institute report “Realizing the Strategic National Value of our Trade, Tourism and Ports of Entry with Mexico” we note: Six million U.S. jobs depend on our trade with Mexico. Mexico is our nation’s number two export market in the world and our number three trading partner overall. Mexico is our nation’s second most important foreign tourism market as well as the fourth-ranked in terms of spending by tourists.

The bipartisan “Gang of Eight’s” Border Security, Economic Opportunity, and Immigration Modernization Act of 2013 proposes the addition of 3,500 additional Customs and Border Protection officers to staff the ports of entry on the southern border. It would seem that Congress is finally acknowledging a simple truth, investing in the facilitation of greater trade through our southern border is an investment in our national economy. Twenty-three states have Mexico as their number one or number two trading partner. As such it should come as no surprise that after the first week of markup the additional staffing has remained in the legislation and is likely to be included or enhanced in the House version of the bill.

## Disads - China

### 1NC

#### Unique link – China’s current economic strategy is allowing them to outpace US influence in Latin America – plan reverses that

Gallagher 6/18/13 – associate professor of international relations at Boston University (Kevin P, “Time for a U.S. Pivot to Latin America”, <http://www.theglobalist.com/storyid.aspx?storyid=10035>, CMR)

Increasingly, Latin American countries see China not as a rival but as a valuable trading partner. In fact, explains Kevin Gallagher, China has become a better partner in many ways than the United States. China is offering attractive deals to Latin American economies, while the United States continues to lecture and dictate. It's time for a real reset in U.S.-Latin American trade relations.¶ The Obama administration and U.S. media have made much ado about the U.S. "pivot" to Asia.¶ What has largely escaped their attention, however, is that China has been lining up economic allies in the erstwhile "backyard" of the United States.¶ Well, just as serious competition ought to awaken one's creative juices in business, it is time for the United States to step up a suitable economic policy for Latin America before it is too late.¶ The difference in approaches by the United States and China in Latin America were squarely brought into focus just in recent weeks when U.S. Vice President Joseph Biden and Chinese President Xi Jinping made tours of Latin America.¶ The United States principal offer to its Latin American neighbors is the Trans-Pacific Partnership. The TPP offers access to the U.S. market to Latin American and Asian nations on the basis of a triple form of conditionality.¶ First, they must deregulate their financial markets; second, adopt intellectual property provisions that give preferences to U.S. firms; and third, allow private U.S. firms to directly sue governments of countries that sign up to the TPP for violating any of its conditions.¶ Talk about a heavily conditioned offering. So what's the Chinese approach?¶ On his visit to the region, China's President Xi Jinping offered more than $5.3 billion in financing, with few conditions attached, to China's newfound Latin American friends.¶ These offers will need to be confirmed, but according to press reports the Chinese have signed deals on this trip for:¶ $3 billion in commitments to eight Caribbean countries for infrastructure and energy;¶ $1.3 billion to Costa Rica in loans and lines of credit, including a $900 million dollar loan from the Chinese Development Bank for upgrading a petroleum refinery and a $400 million dollar line of credit for road infrastructure from the Chinese Ex-Im Bank; and a¶ $1 billion credit line from the China Ex-Im bank to Mexico for its state-owned oil company PEMEX.¶ Making available this financing comes on top of the already $86 billion in financing provided by China to Latin American governments since 2003.¶ China offers Latin American countries what they want, while U.S. offers always come with strings attached.¶ Granted, that amount — large as it sounds — seems just like another number in today's world.¶ To put it into proper perspective, consider this:¶ Since 2003, thus over the past decade, China's policy banks have provided more finance to Latin America than their counterparts at the World Bank, the Inter-American Development Bank and the U.S. Export-Import Bank.¶ If anything ought to awaken the United States from its past slumber and taking Latin America essentially for granted, that comparison ought to do it.¶ Simply put, the United States and the array of largely Western-dominated international financial institutions have been outgunned by China's financial muscle. Welcome to the brave new world!¶ But it's not just a matter of sheer numbers. Unlike U.S. trade treaties or the finance from the international financial institutions largely under U.S. control, China offers up its loans come with few strings attached.

#### Internal link – US-Sino competition risks open conflict

Ellis 6/6/13 – associate professor with the William J. Perry Center for Hemispheric Defense Studies (R Evan, “China's New Backyard”, <http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2013/06/06/china_s_new_backyard_latin_america?page=full>, CMR)

The challenge to Washington from China's presence in the region also extends beyond economics and policy objectives. The U.S. Defense Department's critical posture regarding Chinese cyberattacks is a reminder that hostilities between the United States and China, though highly improbable and undesirable, are not unthinkable. In such a conflict, China-operated ports, airports, telecommunications infrastructure, and other parts of the Chinese commercial presence in Latin America would represent potential assets in a global asymmetric warfare campaign against the United States.

#### Impact – US-China war causes extinction

Johnson 2 – president of the Japan Policy Research Institute, a tax-exempt nonprofit educational and research organization (Chalmers, Okinawa Between the United States and Japan, January, <http://www.jpri.org/publications/occasionalpapers/op24.html>, CMR)

China is another matter. **No sane figure** in the Pentagon **wants a war with China,** and all serious US militarists know that China’s minuscule nuclear capacity is not offensive but a deterrent against the overwhelming US power arrayed against it (twenty archaic Chinese warheads versus more than 7,000 US warheads). Taiwan, whose status constitutes the still incomplete last act of the Chinese civil war, remains the most dangerous place on earth. Much as the 1914 assassination of the Austrian crown prince in Sarajevo led to a war that no wanted, a misstep in Taiwan by any side could bring the **U**nited **S**tates **and China in**to **a conflict** that neither wants. Such a war **would bankrupt the U**nited **S**tates, deeply divide Japan **and probably end in a Chinese victory, given that China is the world’s most populous country and would be defending itself against a foreign aggressor.** More seriously, **it could easily escalate into a** nuclear holocaust. However, given the nationalistic challenge to China’s sovereignty of any Taiwanese attempt to declare its independence formally, forward-deployed US forces on China’s borders have virtually no deterrent effect.

### UQ – Cuba

#### China is sustaining economic activity with Cuba – key to regional influence

LeoGrande 13 – professor in the Department of Government, School of Public Affairs at American University in Washington, D.C. (William M, “The Danger of Dependence: Cuba's Foreign Policy After Chavez”, April 2, <http://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/12840/the-danger-of-dependence-cubas-foreign-policy-after-chavez>, CMR)

As China's rapid growth has transformed it into a global powerhouse, Beijing has expanded its economic and diplomatic presence in Latin America, and is now Cuba's second-largest trade partner. China provides Cuba with a range of durable goods and capital equipment, and is investing in Cuban nickel and oil production. Like China's relations with the rest of the region, its relations with Cuba are fundamentally commercial rather than ideological, aimed at securing China's access to raw materials.

### UQ – Mexico

#### China pursuing influence in Mexico in response to US Asia pivot

The Economist 6/8/13 (“From pivot to twirl”, <http://www.economist.com/news/china/21579062-chinese-leader-tries-smooth-move-americas-backyard-pivot-twirl>, CMR)

LIKE a veteran salsa dancer, Xi Jinping, the Chinese president, has responded to the United States’s “pivot” to Asia with his own twirl south of the Rio Grande. A month after a re-elected Barack Obama paid calls on Costa Rica and Mexico, Mr Xi followed in his footsteps, visiting San José and Mexico City from June 2nd to 6th.¶ He spent the previous weekend in Trinidad and Tobago, arriving in America’s mare nostrum four days after Joe Biden, America’s vice-president. As a welcome, the 280-strong Chinese entourage was greeted with the sound of “Ah Feel to Party”, a calypso classic, and China further enhanced the mood by promising $3 billion in (unspecified) soft loans to the eight Caribbean heads of government who trailed through to meet Mr Xi. Mr Biden, by contrast, got an earful of complaints that America no longer cared about the region.¶ Ahead of his planned meeting with Mr Obama in Southern California, Mr Xi’s choice of destinations looked to some like an intriguing “shot across the bow” to America, possibly in response to Mr Obama’s courting of countries in China’s orbit, such as Myanmar. On this trip, his first to Latin America as president, Mr Xi did not visit Brazil, China’s biggest trading partner in the region, nor ideological allies Cuba and Venezuela. Instead, he chose two free-trade partners of America, one of which, Mexico, is so tightly bound to its northern neighbour that it sells to America in eight days what it sells to China in a year.¶ There was more than superpower politics in play, though. Costa Rica and Mexico are not the commodity exporters that China has tended to court. Mexico, in particular, is a rival low-cost manufacturer, raising the possibility that China, with its wages increasing and its distance from the United States hurting its competitiveness, may now be looking for export platforms to target America.¶ Mr Xi’s singling out of Mexico for special attention was his most surprising move. Last year Mexican academics complained that the bilateral relationship had reached its lowest point since diplomatic relations restarted in 1972, hit by tiffs over Mexican H1N1 flu in 2009 and a presidential audience with the exiled Tibetan leader, the Dalai Lama, in 2011. With government-to-government ties strained, finicky trade disputes all but closed the Chinese markets to Mexican goods such as tequila and pork. China’s investment in Mexico has been minute.

### Link – Mexico

#### China is successfully capturing influence in Mexico – competition with US economic tactics is zero-sum

Funaro 6/4/13 (Kaitlin, “Xi flies to Mexico as China battles US for influence in Latin America”, <http://www.globalpost.com/dispatch/news/regions/asia-pacific/china/130604/xi-flies-mexico-china-battles-us-influence-latin-ame>, CMR)

Chinese President Xi Jinping is making the most of his four-country tour of the Americas to position China as a competitor to the US and Taiwan's economic influence in the region.¶ Xi arrives in Mexico Tuesday for a three-day visit in which he and Mexican President Enrique Peña Nieto are expected to discuss their economic ties.¶ The two nations are economic partners but also competitors, particularly when it comes to exports to the United States.¶ Mexico and China both enjoy strong exports to the American market but Mexico itself has been flooded with cheap Chinese goods that are displacing domestic goods.¶ "China is a complicated case" for Mexico, Aldo Muñoz Armenta, political science professor at the Autonomous University of Mexico State told USA Today.¶ "It's not the healthiest (relationship) in diplomatic terms because the balance of trade has been so unequal."¶ When it comes to economic influence, China may be gaining the upper hand in Latin America.¶ China is increasing its funding to the region just as the US has been coming under pressure to cut aid and investment.¶ "If I’m a Latin American leader, I’m very happy because I now have more chips to play with," Kevin Gallagher, author of the 2010 book "The Dragon in the Room," about China’s inroads in Latin America, told Bloomberg.¶ "The onus is on the US to come up with a more flexible, attractive offer but that’s not so easy because it doesn’t have the deep pockets like it used to."¶ Latin America's growing economy makes for an attractive investment.¶ The International Monetary Fund forecasts the region’s economies will expand 3.4 percent this year, almost three times the pace of growth in the developed world.¶ Xi's tour of Trinidad, Costa Rica and Mexico are setting the stage for his visit to California later this week, which will be his first face-to-face talks with Obama since taking office.¶ That Xi's Latin America trip came so early into his presidency is a confident approach that shows little concern for American reaction, Evan Ellis, a professor at the National Defense University in Washington told Bloomberg.¶ "In the past Chinese presidents were very deferential to the US., always making reference to Washington’s backyard," Ellis said. "You don’t hear any of that from Xi’s team, though you don’t find any threatening rhetoric either."

#### China is gaining regional influence by pursuing engagement with Mexico – failed US strategy is key

Ellis 6/6/13 – associate professor with the William J. Perry Center for Hemispheric Defense Studies (R Evan, “China's New Backyard”, <http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2013/06/06/china_s_new_backyard_latin_america?page=full>, CMR)

Make no mistake: China is now a presence in the region. Xi's trip to Trinidad and Tobago is only the second visit by a Chinese president to the Caribbean -- his predecessor, Hu Jintao, visited communist Cuba in November 2008 -- but China and the Caribbean's economic and political ties have been growing rapidly. On this trip, Xi promised more than $3 billion in loans to 10 Caribbean countries and Costa Rica. Xi's choice of three destinations near the United States, followed by a "shirt-sleeves" summit with U.S. President Barack Obama on June 7 and 8 at the Sunnylands resort in California, sends a subtle message that the new Chinese leadership seeks to engage the United States globally as an equal -- without the deference shown in the past to the United States in countries close to its borders.¶ Ironically, it's the Latin American country closest to the United States where Xi might be able to make up the most ground. Mexican President Enrique Peña Nieto's engagement with the Chinese president, both at the April summit in Boao, China, and this week in Mexico City, allow him to differentiate himself from his pro-U.S. predecessor, Felipe Calderón. Similarly, Mexico's role in forming the Pacific Alliance, a new subregional organization built around a group of four pro-market, pro-trade countries (Chile, Colombia, Mexico, and Peru) allows Mexico to reassert a leadership role in the Americas, relatively independent of the United States.

#### Lack of US economic activity is allowing China to build up influence in Mexico

USA Today 6/3/13 (“President Xi uses trip to increase China's influence”, <http://www.usatoday.com/story/news/politics/2013/06/06/presidential-china-summit-sunnylands/2397129/>, CMR)

RANCHO MIRAGE, Calif. — When Chinese President Xi Jinping's four-nation tour of the Americas comes here Friday for a two-day summit with President Barack Obama, area economists and economic development officials say China already will have taken fresh steps to bolster its economic influence in nations such as Costa Rica, Mexico, and Trinidad and Tobago.¶ Xi took office in March and has used the trip to expand China's exports and relations:¶ • Friday, the Chinese leader met with Prime Minister Kamla Persad-Bissessar of the Caribbean Republic of Trinidad and Tobago — a nation rich in liquefied natural gas — where they announced they had discussed ways to cooperate in key areas of energy, minerals, infrastructure development, telecommunications and agriculture.¶ • Monday, Xi met Costa Rican President Laura Chinchilla to discuss commercial and energy projects, including upgrading the Central American country's oil refineries and developing a free-trade zone.¶ • Tuesday, in Mexico, President Enrique Pena Nieto and business leaders met with Chinese delegates to determine ways to reduce Mexico's large trade deficit while strengthening trade links. Mexican officials said while $57 billion of Mexico's imports — 15% — came from China last year, Mexico only exported $5.7 billion — 1.5% — to China.¶ "The bottom line is everybody is looking for export markets," said Chapman University economist Esmael Adibi, director of the A. Gary Anderson Center for Economic Research in Orange, Calif. "They're asking, 'Where are the markets that are not fully utilized?' and they're putting their efforts there."¶ Last year, China eclipsed the United States to become the world's biggest trading nation, as measured by total exports and imports of goods (excluding services), according to figures both countries released earlier this year.¶ Chinese exports and imports reached $3.87 trillion last year, the Chinese customs administration reported. The U.S. exports and imports combined for $3.82 trillion in 2012, the Commerce Department said.¶ China's latest efforts to boost export markets in places such as Latin America and Africa don't surprise Wes Ahlgren, chief operating officer for the Coachella Valley Economic Partnership in Palm Springs, Calif. Ahlgren has traveled to China and Europe on trade missions to promote this area's renewable energy and clean technology opportunities.¶ During a recent conference call with U.S. state, trade and commerce officials who were in Africa at the time, Ahlgren said it was clear China has already made substantial investments in Latin America and Africa, and China continues to look for markets, resources and ways to expand its influence.¶ "Similarly, the U.S. foreign policy includes a large component of economic development, foreign military sales, direct investment, support for NGOs (non-government organizations), etc.," Ahlgren said. "Perhaps they are taking a page from our playbook and modeling it to their own vision."¶ At a time when the USA is under financial pressure and has had to cut aid internationally, China is opening its wallet.¶ "Because (China) is so rich with foreign currency and surplus, they are willing to make direct investments in these countries to improve their ties," Adibi said. "Whereas we have budgetary constraints."

### Link UQ – US Strategy Failing/China Fill-In

#### Unique link – Failure of current US economic strategy will surrender influence to China

Gallagher 6/18/13 – associate professor of international relations at Boston University (Kevin P, “Time for a U.S. Pivot to Latin America”, <http://www.theglobalist.com/storyid.aspx?storyid=10035>, CMR)

For too long, the United States has relied on a rather imperial mechanism — just telling Latin America what it needs. Compare that to China's approach: It offers Latin America what it wants (in the form of financing and trade from China).¶ When President Obama took office, he and his team pledged to hit the reset button with the region and rethink its trade regime with Latin America. It hasn't worked out that way.¶ Thus far, "reset" has essentially meant making the same old offer, but via new faces.¶ In addition, too much of the interaction with regional governments has been on such efforts as concentrating on drug interdiction purposes.¶ Those countries rightfully don't see that as much of a growth-enhancing development approach, but rather as a foreign-based, defensive mechanism to protect the U.S. homeland.¶ Given all that, it is high time for the U.S. government to undertake a true rethink of its economic policy toward Latin America. Very soon, it may be too late.

### Internal – Competition = War

#### US-China competition for influence in Latin America causes war

Hilton 13 - London-based writer and broadcaster (Isabel, “China in Latin America: Hegemonic challenge?”, Feb 13, <http://www.peacebuilding.no/var/ezflow_site/storage/original/application/26ff1a0cc3c0b6d5692c8afbc054aad9.pdf>, CMR)

China’s presence in Latin America is unlikely to diminish and will continue to affect its regional partners for the ¶ foreseeable future. Although this undoubtedly entails a ¶ loss of U.S. influence in the region, both China and the U.S. ¶ have so far sought cooperation rather than confrontation. ¶ In the context of the Obama administration’s “pivot” to Asia, however, and the latent, long-term strategic competition ¶ between China and the United States, there is potential ¶ for increasing competition for influence in the future. An ¶ escalation of tensions between China and U.S. allies in the ¶ South China or East China Sea could prompt China to raise ¶ retaliatory tensions in the U.S. backyard. At that point, ¶ the traditional Latin American allies of the U.S. could face ¶ some uncomfortable choices.

#### US-China competition for influence risks open confrontation and a new Cold War

Cerna 11 – graduate student in International Policy Management at Kennesaw State University, Kennesaw, GA (Michael, “China’s Growing Presence,” 4/15, <http://www.chinacenter.net/chinas-growing-presence-in-latin-america-implications-for-u-s-and-chinese-presence-in-the-region/>, CMR)

As it stands, the Chinese are not broadening their relations with the region in a way that directly competes with the United States. China is strictly concerned with commodities, including oil. U.S. President Barack Obama recently signed an agreement with Brazil’s Petrobras that will allow the oil company to drill in the Gulf of Mexico. This symbolic move could cause tensions to increase as the world’s two largest oil consumers battle over rights to Brazilian oil. In that regard, the competition may go beyond a race to Latin commodities and move into the realm of fighting for political influence. It is odd to think that the United States would need to compete for hemispheric dominance with a country on the other side of the globe, but China’s actions and increasing integration into the region tell us that such a scenario may one day arise. Given the proximity and importance of Latin America to the United States, this region could be the symbolic battle that best measures the continued hegemony of the U.S. versus China.¶ With both the U.S. and China jockeying for influence in a world where political power relations are changing, Latin America has the most to gain. The primary concern for the region is that it does not become a battle ground for a neo-Cold War between China and the U.S. Brazil already has clearly stated its concerns regarding Chinese influence. Yet, despite this tension, Brazil is now too reliant on China to turn away from the path on which Lula set the country. Agricultural exports to China are crucial to Brazil’s economy. Lula’s Brazil supported China politically and made clear moves away from the United States. Now Rouseff’s administration has welcomed Barack Obama with open arms. With all three major actors going through stages that could influence the global economic and political landscape – China implementing its 12th five-year plan, Brazil cementing itself as a prominent world player and the U.S. still recovering from a terrible financial crisis – this dynamic relationship is one that deserves close attention from all those concerned with the future of China-U.S. relations. Where Brazil and the rest of Latin America were once looking for an alternative to U.S. influence and found China, the region may now be looking to the U.S. to strike a balance with growing Chinese influence. With the global ambitions of Latin America, namely Brazil, it is essential to maintain close ties with both the United States and China. The world will be watching.

### Impact – Probability 2NC

#### Probability – Chinese regional strategy maximizes the risk of conflict

Shehadey 6/5/13 (Brett, “China’s reverse imperialism – West contains China’s East, China moves West”, <http://chinadailymail.com/2013/06/05/chinas-reverse-imperialism-west-contains-chinas-east-china-moves-west/>, CMR)

The US still has not learned that China does not move in a linear, predictable, pattern. As the US and its allies gain geopolitical ground in the Pacific and power balancing shapes a semi-circle in China’s East, China projects its influence out West. Critics may call it reverse imperialism.¶ This is not just a “backdoor” strategy where China is scavenging around for whatever it can, which was the thinking for a time. In the ancient Chinese game of “Go” (Chinese: weiqi, “encircle [the] piece”) the idea is to surround your opponent’s pieces where possible and maximise territorial gain indirectly.¶ Beijing’s adaptable fallback strategy is second nature to senior political and military leaders. They plan to trade the Pacific theatre for Western US territories – at least until such time as the US can be weakened in the Pacific and confused in many of the other regions it is critically invested into presently.¶ Specifically, China seeks out territorial advantages and strategic vulnerabilities of its greatest rivals. They have exponentially increased penetration deeper into the West, both as a natural course and as an overarching strategy.¶ In total, China is projecting soft national power through Central Asia, Europe, Africa and Latin America; maximising all political-economic methods, replacing US strongholds in political dealings; creating new commercial partnerships with their own bilateral global power swaps and newly formed influential bases of operation.

### DA Turns Solvency

#### Turns case – China will undermine US strategy

Ellis 6/6/13 – associate professor with the William J. Perry Center for Hemispheric Defense Studies (R Evan, “China's New Backyard”, <http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2013/06/06/china_s_new_backyard_latin_america?page=full>, CMR)

The challenges arising from China's global engagement should not, however, be confused with the struggle between the United States and the Soviet Union that characterized the Cold War, in which each side actively promoted different, competing concepts for a global order. China does not seek to impose a new ideology on the world, yet the mercantilist way in which it promotes its economic development, combined with its lack of commitment to international norms that it didn't create, makes it more difficult for the United States to conduct business and pursue policy goals in Latin America and other parts of the world.

### DA Turns Case/Harms

#### Containment backfires – causes US-China conflict and warming, disease, cyber-terror, and prolif – it’s unique because the US is pursuing a cooperative strategy in the SQUO

Nye ’13 – god of soft power, professor at the Harvard Kennedy School and a former Pentagon official (Joseph, “Work With China, Don’t Contain It”, <http://www.nytimes.com/2013/01/26/opinion/work-with-china-dont-contain-it.html?_r=0>, CMR)

CITING an escalating dispute over islands in the East China Sea, The Economist warned last week that “China and Japan are sliding toward war.” That assessment may be too alarmist, but the tensions have bolstered the efforts of some American analysts who have urged a policy to “contain” China.¶ During a recent visit to China, I was struck by how many Chinese officials believe such a policy is already in place and is the central purpose of President Obama’s “pivot” toward Asia. “The pivot is a very stupid choice,” Jin Canrong, a professor of international relations, declared publicly. “The United States has achieved nothing and only annoyed China. China can’t be contained,” he added.¶ Containment was designed for a different era, and it is not what the United States is, or should be, attempting now. At the start of the cold war, containment meant economic isolation of the Soviets and regional alliances like NATO to deter Moscow’s military expansion. Later, to the chagrin of George F. Kennan, the father of containment, the doctrine led to the “domino effect” theory behind the escalation of the Vietnam War.¶ Cold war containment involved virtually no trade and little social contact. But China now is not what the Soviet Union was then. It is not seeking global hegemony, and the United States not only has an immense trade with China but also huge exchanges of students and tourists.¶ When I worked on the Pentagon’s East Asia strategy in 1994, during the Clinton administration, we rejected the idea of containment for two reasons. If we treated China as an enemy, we were guaranteeing a future enemy. If we treated China as a friend, we kept open the possibility of a more peaceful future.¶ We devised a strategy of “integrate but hedge” — something like Ronald Reagan’s “trust but verify.” America supported China’s membership in the World Trade Organization and accepted Chinese goods and visitors. But a 1996 declaration reaffirmed that the postwar United States-Japan security treaty was the basis for a stable and prosperous East Asia. President Clinton also began to improve relations with India to counterbalance China’s rise.¶ This strategy has enjoyed bipartisan support. President George W. Bush continued to improve relations with India, while deepening economic ties with China. His deputy secretary of state, Robert B. Zoellick, made clear that America would accept the rise of China as a “responsible stakeholder.”¶ Mr. Obama’s “rebalancing” toward Asia involves moving naval resources to the Pacific, but also trade, human rights and diplomatic initiatives. As his national security adviser, Thomas E. Donilon, said in November, the American-Chinese relationship “has elements of both cooperation and competition.”¶ Asia is not a monolith, and its internal balance of power should be the key to our strategy. Japan, India, Vietnam and other countries do not want to be dominated by China, and thus welcome an American presence in the region. Unless China is able to attract allies by successfully developing its “soft power,” the rise in its “hard” military and economic power is likely to frighten its neighbors, who will coalesce to balance its power.¶ A significant American military and economic presence helps to maintain the Asian balance of power and shape an environment that provides incentives for China to cooperate. After the 2008-9 financial crisis, some Chinese mistakenly believed that America was in permanent decline and that this presented new opportunities. A result was that China worsened its relations with Japan, India, South Korea, Vietnam and the Philippines — a misstep that confirmed that “only China can contain China.”¶ But America’s rebalancing toward Asia should not be aggressive. We should heed Mr. Kennan’s warning against overmilitarization and ensure that China doesn’t feel encircled or endangered. The world’s two largest economies have much to gain from cooperation on fighting climate change, pandemics, cyberterrorism and nuclear proliferation.¶ With China becoming more dependent on Middle Eastern energy, we should discuss maritime regulations to ensure free passage of ships and include China in Pacific naval exercises. We should help China develop domestic energy resources like shale gas and encourage China and Japan to revive their 2008 plan for joint undersea gas exploitation. And we should make clear that if China meets certain standards, it can join the negotiations over the Trans-Pacific Partnership, a proposed free-trade agreement around the Pacific Rim.¶ Containment is simply not a relevant policy tool for dealing with a rising China. Power is the ability to obtain the outcomes one wants, and sometimes America’s power is greater when we act with others rather than merely over others.

## Critiques

### Neolib Link

#### The rhetoric of economic integration across North American borders externalize and naturalize market forces and limit alternative futures

Gilbert 05  
Emily Gilbert, University of Toronto, “The Inevitability of Integration? Neoliberal Discourse and the Proposals for a New North,” American Economic Space after September 11, Annals of the Association of American Geographers, 95(1), 2005, pp. 202–222

The terrorist attacks of 11 September 2001 had an immediate impact on Canada–U.S. relations. Whereas security¶ became foremost among U.S. concerns, Canada became preoccupied with ensuring that the newly fortified¶ border would not impede trade. Within days of the attacks, Canadian analysts argued that the only way to¶ guarantee open access to U.S. markets would be to negotiate some form of deeper North American economic¶ integration. Previous proposals for a North American Monetary Union were revived, while new initiatives such¶ as a customs union or a ‘‘strategic bargain’’ also emerged. These schemes were designed to forge a ‘‘new economic¶ space’’ in North America. Business think tanks and interest groups played a central role in pushing forward a¶ platform of deeper integration, but the ideas have also made their way into the policy platforms of the Canadian¶ federal government. This paper draws upon discourse analysis and theories of governmentality to interrogate the¶ rhetoric of inevitability that has underpinned these proposals. The fatalism has been justified by allusions to the¶ shifting North American geopolitical relations in the post-September 11 context and the fear and risk that have¶ prevailed since the terrorist attacks. It also, however, resonates more broadly with neoliberal and globalizing¶ narratives that externalize and naturalize market forces, and, therefore, limit alternative futures. More importantly,¶ the logic and language of inevitability have provided advocates of deeper integration with a strategic¶ manoeuvre to downplay concerns regarding the loss of political sovereignty and the transformations to statesociety¶ relationships that would result from the new North American economic space that is being imagined.

#### Ports of entry are the key nodes of neoliberal economic governance.

Heyman 2004  
Josiah McC. Heyman 2004, Department of Sociology and Anthropology, University of Texas at El Paso, Identities: Global Studies in Culture and Power, 11: 303–327, 2004 Ports of Entry as Nodes in the World System

Ports of entry are viewed as nodes in the world system where people and commodities step up and down in value as they move across borders. To understand how this happens, this article examines, in an ethnographic fashion, the interplay of inspectors and crossing populations in United States land ports with Mexico. It focuses on the categorization of commodities as legitimate or illegitimate and the movements of people in class, nationality, and gender-differentiated roles as laborers, shoppers, tourists, managers, and smugglers. It briefly surveys the Mexican-side ports with the United States and then explores new objects of regulation and systems of surveillance, such as intellectual property and national security. The ethnography not only reveals trends in the governance of international flows, but also helps us to understand the social–political construction of value and the continuing role of borders in demarcating and enforcing global inequalities in an era supposedly marked by free trade and transnational movement. Differential access to mobility and incomplete but forceful efforts at enclosure are thus shown to be crucial to the reproduction and remaking of combined and unequal spatial (world systemic) relations.